P 117

BIBLIOTHECA

FF. PRÆDICATORUM

CONVENTUS

CIVIT. BENITIÆ

Lit.

Pl.

ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENTS

OF

ANGLICANISM;

OR,

A HISTORY OF THE LITURGIES, HOMILIES,
ARTICLES, BIBLES,
PRINCIPLES AND GOVERNMENTAL SYSTEM OF THE

Church of England.

BY
THE REV. W. WATERWORTH, S.J.
LONDON.

LONDON:
BURNS & LAMBERT, 17 PORTMAN STREET,
PORTMAN SQUARE,
AND 63 PATERNOSTER ROW.

MDCCCLIV.

PRINTED BY WILLLIAM DAVY AND SON, GILBERT STREET.

TO THE VERY REV.

THE REV. P. BECKX,

GENERAL OF THE SOCIETY OF JESUS,

This Work

IS MOST RESPECTFULLY DEDICATED

BY HIS PATERNITY'S OBEDIENT SERVANT,

THE AUTHOR.

au. 1154

PREFACE.

In a former Volume, I have traced the spiritual connexion of England and the Holy See, from the times of Lever Maur, who applied to Rome in the second century for instructers in the faith, down to the sixteenth century, when Henry the Eight dissolved the ancient union, and attached to the English Crown the rights and prerogatives which had till then been unhesitatingly, and on principle, conceded to the Roman Pontiffs.

To describe the grounds on which this transfer of power was based; to trace the origin of the liturgical, symbolical, and other authoritative works which appeared in the reigns of Henry, and of his two children, Edward and Elizabeth; and to examine in detail every important circumstance connected with the Bible, which *after* the separation of England from Rome had been effected, was proclaimed to be, what it has ever since been believed to be, the only rule of faith of Anglicanism, are the objects which I propose to myself in the following pages.

The subjects referred to are obviously of great importance; for on them turns the whole question of the divine or human origin of the English Reformation. If it can be shown that passion and not revelation; that arbitrary power and not divine right, were considered in the establishment of the Church of England; if further it can be demonstrated that the symbolical and doctrinal works of

the Reformers were characterized by inconsistency and contradictions, it will be readily conceded that the new religion was simply a human institution—*a kingdom of this world*, and nothing better.

Now, it appears to me, that all this, and much more indeed, can easily be established by facts as patent as the history of Henry's divorce from Queen Catherine, of Henry's parliaments, and of the innovations connected with religion, which marked the three score and eight years which intervened between the apostacy of Henry the Eighth and the death of Elizabeth.

These facts will be fully and accurately stated in the sequel of this volume; and further, such inferences as logically flow from the historical premises will be briefly laid before the reader, in order that a correct estimate may be formed of that system of belief, which has been guarded for the last three hundred years, by the two-edged sword of penal statutes and state-patronage.

Though the questions discussed in this volume may have frequently been laid before the English public in former publications, they have not, it is believed, been ever treated in the manner here adopted. Several writers, for example, have ably developed the Solibiblical principle; they have, too, when engaged on the delineation of Protestantism, referred to those frequent changes both in doctrine and practice, which were the natural results of Erastianism; but no one has, I think, sifted the sixth Article in relation to the Deutero-canonical writings, or reduced the *whole* of Anglicanism to its original elements, and thus tested its nature and its origin.

To me this analytical process seems highly satisfactory and conclusive. It enables the reader to see things as

they really are; whilst it removes the earthy mound beneath which truth has been too long buried.

No pains have been spared to render this work both interesting and useful; and with this conviction I submit my endeavours to the discriminating judgment of the friends of truth. Partizans—men who adhere to systems and opinions not from a conviction of their being true, but on account of their agreement with religious or political prepossessions—will not approve of what I have recorded in relation to Anglicanism. They would have me and others forget the origin of the establishment; and instead of stating with Macauley that "the Church of England sprang from a compromise, huddled up between the eager zeal of Reformers and the selfishness of greedy, ambitious, and time-serving politicians," they would wish me to describe it as venerable and Heaven-sent. But this I could not do. My object in writing is to teach; and all instruction should be truth. Truth is above and beyond party feeling or individualism: it admits not of deflections: it goes straightforward:—

Ὀρθον ἡ ἀληθεὶ ἀεὶ.

To sacrifice truth to party, or not to declare it openly where revelation and man's eternal interests are at stake, must ever be looked upon as an unworthy compromise, and the very worst species of religious treachery.

QUI NON LIBERE VERITATEM PRONUNCIAT, PRODITOR EST VERITATIS.
Instit. Just.

9, HILL STREET, LONDON,
Dec. 8th, 1854.

ERRATA.

Page 47, note, *for* Gebet, *read* Gerbet.
,, 220, line 5, dele *and third*.
,, 246, line 1, *for* Hiliary, *read* Hilary.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.—*Anglican statements relative to the defection of the Universal Church.*

Statement of the Homilies relative to an universal apostacy.—Consequences derivable from this statement.—These consequences, as well as the general accusations proved to be untenable. 1

CHAPTER II.—*Examination of the principle laid down in the Homilies relative to the defection of the Church.*

The Church infallible—proved first by an universal testification, and secondly, by the Scriptures of the New Law, which are a realization of the prophecies of the Old Testament.—Use and end of the Ministry.—This end attained in Catholicity.—The Ministry is useless on Protestant grounds.—The Protestant allegation of defection disproved.—The charge of idolatry shown to be absolutely groundless, from the zeal and character of the Missioners of the middle ages, the countries they converted, the monuments they erected, the books they wrote; as also from even the Protestant catalogue of Saints.—Origin and progress of the Protestant calumny.—The charge not substantiated by reference to Catholic doctrines.—These doctrines are defended by eminent Protestants.—General observations on the folly and falseness of the Homilies 2

CHAPTER III.—*On the Origin and Authority of the Articles of Religion of Henry VIII, Edward VI, and Queen Elizabeth.*

Importance of the examination of the History of the Articles.—Their authority in the Anglican Church.—Henry's innovations destructive of Episcopal and Clerical authority, generally.—The six Articles, and works in connexion with them.—These Articles, &c. forced on the people.—The principle involved in the framing of the Articles, destructive of Anglicanism.—Fox and others write against the Articles.—The Articles and religion of Henry are changed by King Edward.—History of the origin, number, nature, and subscription of the Articles of Edward VI.—The Articles mainly formed by Cranmer.—His vacillating character.—Reproached for his changes by Gardiner, &c.—Still, always dogmatical, imperious, and cruel.—Persecution of Mary.—Her firmness.

—Articles of Elizabeth; their number and distinctive character.—Reported ignorance of the framers of the Thirty-nine Articles. The Articles are enforced and subscribed.—Review of the changes in the national religion during the reigns of Henry, Edward, and Elizabeth.—These Changes wholly dependant on individuals.—Proved from the Zurich letters.—The Articles are worthless as an authority.—This admitted even by Anglicans.—Observations of Le Maistre on Protestant Articles.—Difference between the origin of the Articles, and the Profession of Faith of Pope Pius.—Justification of the latter..... 50

CHAPTER IV.—*On the Origin and Authority of the Homilies.*

Origin and end of the Homilies.—Read in all Churches, by Order.—Their authors.—Character of these Authors.—Specimens of their gross inconsistencies and contradictions.—The Homilies approved of by the Articles, but disliked by the People.—Signs of dislike.—Condemned as false and contradictory.—The Justice of this condemnation.—They are worthless in themselves and in their origin 109

CHAPTER V.—*On the Anglican Liturgies.*

History of the Liturgical changes.—Forms of prayer condemned, though previously ascribed to the Holy Ghost.—History of the Primer, &c. in Henry's time.—Edward's Liturgies.—Changes in them.—Authors of the changes.—Elizabeth's Liturgy.—Changes, and grounds of the alterations.—The Liturgy disapproved of formerly and now.—The objections raised against it.—Alterations suggested.—The changes in the Liturgy as well as in the Articles, prove the hollowness and worldliness of Anglicanism.—Observations on the words "*our Liturgy.*"—Whence did the Anglicans derive those prayers, of which they boast so much? 122

CHAPTER VI.—*On the Royal Supremacy.*

At the accession of Henry, not the King, but the Pope was head of the English Church.—His power considered to be divine, and as such defended by Henry himself.—Henry's work—The title conferred on him in consequence.—Henry abandons the Pope, and makes himself head of the Church.—His conduct, and that of the Clergy, during the change.—Awful extent of the royal assumption—Secured to him by Acts of Parliament, by oaths, &c.—Subserviency of the Clergy, and their subsequent abject condition.—More and Fisher die in defence of the Papal Supremacy.—Edward's claims to and exercise of the Supremacy.—Remonstrance of the Clergy.—Indignation of the German and Helvetic Reformers. — Elizabeth refuses the title of *Head*, but assumes that of *Governor* of the Church, with all the prerogatives of the Supremacy.—Remarks on the change in the title, by the Anglicans and others.—Opposition of the Catholic Clergy to Elizabeth's claims to the Supremacy.—Results.—The Supremacy ever since claimed by and allowed to our Sovereigns by Parliament.—Grounds raised for the

maintenance of the Supremacy proved to be untenable.—Consequences to England's Christianity flowing from the assumed Supremacy.—Folly of the recent address made to the Queen, relative to the Independence of the Church in England.—The scriptural proof in favour of the Royal Supremacy, false as a fact, and absurd as an argument.—No *mission* in the Anglican Church.—The marks of the Church have disappeared here ever since a King was substituted for the Pope.. 138

CHAPTER VII.—*On the Anglican Authorized Bible.*

Heretics, both ancient and modern, adopt some distinctive version of the Scriptures.—Necessity of this; and consequent recriminations.—Translations formerly approved of, but condemned by Henry VIII.—Elizabeth's Bibles denounced.—The Authorized version of 1611.—History of this version.—The Translators, and the rules which they were obliged by James to follow.—No correct Anglican Bible till seventy-seven years after the Reformation.—Consequences to be drawn from this admission, fatal to the Reformation.—The Authorized Version has been and is complained of by the learned.—Proofs.—Lowth has shaken to pieces the very foundations on which the translation of the Old Testament was based.—Obvious difficulties in connexion with the translation of the New Testament.—Development of the principles of this difficulty.—Labours of Mills and others to recover the true Apostolic text.—Proofs given in detail of the ignorance and unfitness of the English translators 177

CHAPTER VIII.—*On the meaning of the word, Holy Scriptures; and on the inspiration, authenticity, and canonicity of the Bible.*

Importance of this examination, and the difficulty it involves.—Meaning of the word Bible.—Origin, age, country, and character of the sacred writings.—Inspiration required.—What it is.—Protestant theories developed.—No fixed ideas on this head, though inspiration is essential to the Bible.—By extrinsic proofs only can inspiration be proved—admitted by Taylor, Hooker, &c.—Foolish proofs of inspiration adduced by Anglicans from Christ's words.—Authenticity.—The canonical writings.—The sixth Article on this head, false.—Some works admitted by Protestants, were formerly doubted of as much as those writings which they reject.—Continuous evidence on this head.—Principles advocated by Cyril and others for discovering the canonicity of any writing.—Whether Protestants reject or receive tradition, their position is untenable.—Belief of the Church at the end of the fourth century relative to the sacred books.—Lists of the Scriptures drawn up at Carthage, at Rome, and elsewhere.—Detailed and specific examination of each of the divine writings rejected by Protestants.—Their canonicity clearly established.—Falseness of the sixth Article in whatever way it be tested.—Protestants know absolutely nothing of the origin and mode of settling the canon of the Old Testament.—Varying accounts on this head, in respect to Esdras, the Synagogue, and the works forming the

Bible, at various periods.—Even after Esdras, books added to the Canon.—Testimony of Josephus, and the principle involved in it.—Observations on the statement of the sixth Article in connexion with St. Jerome.—The statement unfair, and disproved by St. Jerome himself.—Catholic principle advocated by this Saint..... 194

CHAP. IX.—*The Solibiblical principle—its difficulties and contradictions.*

The Solibiblical principle false—opposed to the teaching of Christ, his Apostles, and the Church of all ages, and in direct opposition to the antisymbolical origin and character of the Sacred writings.—Mode of acting of Christ, the Apostles, and the Church.—How many Apostles wrote, and why they wrote.—The generative principle of faith in the Apostolic and after times.—Testimonies of the Fathers on this head. The Solibiblical principle unavailable for more than 1400 years.—The Scriptures decide nothing about their own meaning—this evidenced by the Sects which pretend to believe the Bible.—Selden's observations and Henry the Eighth's restrictions.—The Scripture full of difficulties—cause of this.—Proposed limitation of this principle.—Useless as a principle of faith and unjust in Anglicanism.—Examination of the texts ordinarily adduced in favour of the Bible being the only "*Rule of Faith.*"—The Biblical system justly opposed by Catholics.—It is irreconcilable too with numerous tenets believed in by the English Church.—Instances in proof.—Motives of the adherence of Catholics to the authority of the Church. 264

CHAP. X.—*On the Zeal of the Catholics in Transcribing and Circulating the Sacred Scriptures, and the Grounds of Opposition to the Bible Society.*

Catholic Zeal in Transcribing, Translating, and Spreading the Sacred Scriptures, attested by Protestants, and evidenced by a Multiplicity of Manuscripts in the various Libraries of Europe, &c.—Continuation and Extension of this Zeal after the Discovery of the Art of Printing.—Bibles published in every Ancient and nearly every Modern Language.—Continuous proofs of this point.—Zeal and favour of the Popes.—Catholic Commentators as contrasted with Protestant Annotators.—Origin of the Protestant Idea respecting Catholic Opposition to the Scriptures.—Origin of the Index, and History of the Fourth Rule.—This Rule both Wise and Truthful, and conformable to the Apostolic Teaching.—Even Protestants approve of the Principle advocated in the Fourth Rule.—Modification of the Rule under altered circumstances.—Causes of the Opposition of the Pontiffs to the Bible Society.—These Causes just and commendable.—Antagonism of the Members of the Bible Society.—This Antagonism clearly demonstrated.—Conclusion. 345

APPENDIX 391

THE

ENGLISH REFORMATION.

Chapter the First.

Anglican statements relative to the defection of the Universal Church.

CONTENTS.

Statement of the Homilies relative to an universal apostacy.—Consequences derivable from this statement.—These consequences, as well as the general accusations proved to be untenable.

It is stated in the second book of Homilies, that "*Laity and Clergy, learned and unlearned, all ages, sects, and degrees of men, women, and children, of whole Christendom (an horrible and most dreadful thing to think), have been at once drowned in abominable idolatry: of all other vices most detested of God, and most damnable to man, and that by the space of eight hundred years and more.*"[1] The

[1] Third part of the Sermon against the Peril of Idolatry, p. 150, Ed. 1683. The second book of Homilies was first published in 1562; the first was printed as early as 1547. Cranmer and Becon were the principal writers of the first book, and Bishop Jewel of the second.

Homilies, if we may credit the declaration of the thirty-fifth of the Thirty-nine Articles, contain "*a godly and wholesome doctrine and necessary for these times.*"[1] On their first publication, they were commanded to be read in every Church of the land, by the parochial Clergy, on whose capacity or orthodoxy neither Edward nor Elizabeth could rely;[2] and every minister is still bound to read them, at least privately,[3] inasmuch as he subscribes the Articles, and through them declares, that the doctrine of the Homilies is "godly and wholesome"; for how can this declaration be honestly made, if the Homilies have not been attentively studied? From this statement, then, which ministers and people are commanded to believe in, and which is repeated over and over again, not only in the Homilies,[4] but also in the writings of the first Reformers, it follows, that Christianity had, according to Protestant belief, wholly and entirely disappeared from the face of the earth; that from the year 734 down to the year 1534, when Protestantism was introduced into this country, under the auspices of our eighth Henry, idolatry had prevailed everywhere; men, women, and children, having all forfeited the grace of Christianity, become objects of detestation to the Deity, and amenable to Heaven's severest chastisements.

Christianity, we are also told, was re-introduced by the Anglican Reformation. Then idolatry became legally extinct; and in the Prayer-book of the Established Church, composed in 1548, was seen the manifestation of the Holy Spirit,—that work having been composed "*by the aid of*

[1] See thirty-fifth Article.

[2] Ibid., and Burnet's Exposition of the Articles, p. 375, Ed. 1705.

[3] Burnet's Articles, p. 376.

[4] Burnet, ibid.

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

the Holy Ghost,"[5] as we are solemnly assured, in the preamble to the act of Parliament which approved of the new Liturgy, and also enacted, under severe penalties, that it, and it only, should be used by every minister of the Church whilst celebrating divine service, through the length and breadth of the land.

In the above statements, two most important propositions are contained: 1° Not only *may* Christianity, or the one form of faith established by Jesus Christ, fail, but as a matter of fact, it did fail utterly; and, for nearly a thousand years, the system of religion introduced by our blessed Saviour, was nothing more than matter of history —it was a thing which had once been, but which, eventually, had ceased to be. 2° When Christianity was again restored, it was restored by the English Reformers, aided by a divinely assisted Parliament: the *Articles* of the new religion contained the symbol of orthodoxy; the *Common Prayer-book* was a work of more than human wisdom; and *the Homilies* taught a godly and wholesome doctrine.

Now, I need hardly inform the reader, that both these propositions are absolutely and unhesitatingly denied by the vast majority of the Christian world. The first assertion is denied by *all Catholics*, and the second is disallowed by *the whole of Christendom*, if we except the comparatively small establishment, known by the name of the Anglican Church. The Catholic Church, which is spread

[5] See the preamble in *Burnet's Reformation*, vol. ii, p. 93, Ed. 1683; as also in Lingard's Hist. of England, vol. iv, p. 396, Ed. 4to. This preamble is remarkable, on account of a gross falsehood. It states that the Prayer-book had been drawn up with one common agreement; whereas, it is a well-known fact, that eight out of the eighteen prelates, on the committee which framed the Liturgy, voted against it.—*Lord's Journals*, 331.

over nearly the whole universe, and which counts its followers by hundreds of thousands,—followers, who have in every age given to the world the noblest proofs of intellectuality, of genius, and of devoted piety,—proofs, which arrest the attention of the student and of the scholar, in this, as well as other lands, and which, neither time, nor influences more destructive than time, have been, or ever will be, able to obliterate, not only denies the fact of the errancy of the Church, but also, *the possibility* of such an occurrence. This mighty body, consisting, perhaps, of two hundred millions of members, asserts, that the Church has not erred, and that it cannot err, since Jesus Christ has promised to guard His Church against all error, even unto the end of time. Such is the Catholic statement; and if the decision of this question were left to mere human evidence—if nations, or numbers, or learning,[1] or sanctity, were allowed to be decisive in such a matter, it is plain that Protestantism would be cast; units would have to yield to thousands, and before our millions of scholars and armies of saints, the fautors of the new system would have to hide their diminished heads.

If, then, it can be made manifest, that the Anglican Church can, at the best, offer only human evidence, in favour either of this or any other distinctive conclusion,

[1] Anglicans are for ever boasting of their own learning, and speaking contemptuously of the learning of Catholic countries. Cobbett took an easy way of testing the accuracy of the English idea. He fixed upon a period most favourable to English, and least favourable to French and Italian literature—the period ranging from 1600 to 1787. Now what was the result of this examination? This: whilst England, Ireland and Scotland could only boast of 132 writers of eminence during that period, France could point to 676, and benighted Italy to 164!—See *Cobbett's Letters*, p. 34, 8vo Ed.

it will be clearly seen, not only that the bold and Christianity-destroying statement, contained in this first proposition, is utterly reckless and untrue, but also, that the book of Homilies, in which this position is maintained, and the Articles which sanction the Homilies, are valueless as authorities. Now, all this can easily be established, as we shall show during the course of this work.

The other proposition, which asserts, that when Christianity was again restored, it was restored by the English Reformers, and that the English Church professes the one form of faith which the Apostles originally taught, is again denied, and denied, as I have already observed, with increased emphasis. Not only do Catholics rise up in opposition, but the Eastern and Western world treats the declaration with scorn. Greeks, and Nestorians, and Eutychians, as well as Lutherans, Calvinists, Socinians, Baptists, Presbyterians, Wesleyans, and the professors of a hundred other creeds, all proclaim the word to be false. The former tell the Anglicans, that the Protestant creed is a creed of yesterday, a creed unheard of in past times; whilst the latter point to their sects as the living representatives of the Church of former ages; and they openly declare, that therefore have they joined the ranks of dissent, because, through dissent only, could they become real professors of Christ's one faith.[2] Such is the view, which all but Anglicans take, of the grounds of the Reformation, and of the character of that Establishment,

[2] Although, to gain the favor of the Dissenters, some Low Church ministers have lately asserted, that the differences between Anglicanism and Dissent are trifling, neither Dissenters have adopted this notion, nor will the writings and *laws* issued against Dissent, bear out this time-serving statement.

which arose in England in the sixteenth century,—a view not certainly very flattering, either to the originators, or to the actual defenders of the new Church.

The propositions, however, are too important to be thus hastily passed over; on them the most important results depend. If it can be shown that the Church cannot err, then is the old, the unreformed Church, the Church which discards the very notion of errancy, which upholds the principle of inerrancy, and assumes an unchanging *semper eadem* for its glorious motto, to be believed; and reform in all its shapes, is proved to be erring reason, set up in opposition to the Divine mind, *the apotheosis of ignorance, and the metamorphosis of truth.* Obviously, then, the question of the errancy or inerrancy of the Church, is deserving of the greatest attention. On the Church's inerrancy, the Catholic relies with confidence; here is his anchor of security, and here his answer to all separatists. These may prophecy the downfall of the Church; they may declaim against a hundred truths, and call them blasphemies; but he is unmoved. Believing in the authority of the Church, he feels assured, that though the storm may rage, the mystic vessel will not founder; though numerous enemies may assail the Church, it will not be overcome: to be lashed by the waves, to be assailed by enemies, was to be the lot of the Church; but to endure for ever, to survive every assailant, *that* was likewise to be its destiny. Though accused of error, it shall be truthful, for Christ the truth is with it; and though scoffed at as foolish, it shall still be heaven-informed, for with it and in it, the Spirit of wisdom unceasingly abides. On the other hand, the Protestant of the Church of England justifies his Reformation, and his rejection of the

olden Church,[1] on the supposition of the actual failure of the Church. If it have not failed, then his system is false, and worse than worthless; it is Anti-christian, and essentially blasphemous. But mark! Whilst the Church's inerrancy proves the falseness of every opposing system of belief, its fallibility would not evidence the truthfulness either of the Anglican or any other form of faith. The scores of conflicting fallible systems, have still to settle their respective differences, and each fallible Church has to prove, that, though fallible, it does not fail, and that the propositions which it enunciates, and the practices which it considers as essential to religion, are, in fact, the revelations and the ordinances of the Almighty. How this is to be done,—how, without some infallible living and teaching authority, the differences which separate and divide this country are to be settled, is a problem, I think, of at least difficult solution. But with this *we* have nothing to do: our observations will be restricted to the doctrinal, sacramental, and governmental developments of the *Anglican Church*. After examining the question of the authority of the Church, we will further consider the evidences which Protestantism offers for the creed of the Articles, and the statements of the Prayer-book and of the Homilies; thus adding evidence to evidence in respect to the real character of that establishment which supplanted the Church of this country, on the 30th day of March, 1534.

[1] See *Jewel's Apology*, *passim*, especially towards the close of the work.

Chapter the Second.

Examination of the principle laid down in the Homilies, relative to the defection of the Church.

CONTENTS.

The Church infallible—proved first by an universal testification, and secondly, by the Scriptures of the New Law, which are a realization of the prophecies of the Old Testament.—Use and end of the Ministry.—This end attained in Catholicity.—The Ministry is useless on Protestant grounds.—The Protestant allegation of defection disproved.—The charge of idolatry shown to be absolutely groundless, from the zeal and character of the Missioners of the middle ages, the countries they converted, the monuments they erected, the books they wrote; as also from even the Protestant catalogue of Saints.—Origin and progress of the Protestant calumny.—The charge not substantiated by reference to Catholic doctrines.—These doctrines are defended by eminent Protestants.—General observations on the folly and falseness of the Homelists.

Can the whole Church of Christ, fall into damnable error, as is stated in the Book of Homilies? My answer shall be clear: the Church of Christ *cannot* err, it cannot *possibly* fall into that damnable idolatry, of which the book of Homilies accuses it. And mark my proof: Christ the founder, the parent of the Church, has absolutely promised to secure it against all error, even unto the end of the world. If further, you bid me say on what grounds I rest this statement, I answer: I am acquainted with this fact in the same way as I am with the fact of the existence of Christ, the original planting of the Church, or the in-

spiration and canonicity of the writings of the New Testament. From a consentient and unanimous testimony, I know that Christ has come into the world, that he has founded a Church, and that the Apostles and others wrote certain documents, under the immediate assistance and inspiration of the Holy Spirit. From a similar consentient and world-wide testimony, I learn what is the essential characteristic of the Church of Christ. All Catholics, spread over the world, testify to TWO FACTS: 1° That the Church cannot err in matters of faith; and 2° That this belief has been handed down, as the declaration of our forefathers, from the days of the Apostles to these our times. From these two facts, which are of world-wide notoriety, it follows, that this belief has been handed down by the last generation of Catholics, to the actual members of the Church. The uniformity and simultaneity of the testification exclude the possibility of doubt on this head. No one nation could be induced to conspire at a given moment to testify to a lie, much less could all the nations of the earth, especially in respect to a matter which involves the eternal interests of so many millions. But in every nation, our fathers have all testified to one and the same thing, as is evidenced by our actual belief; they spoke then according to their belief, and this belief regarding a previous tradition, this very doctrine was taught to them, and, for the same reason, to their forefathers. No moment can be assigned, in which this uniform tradition can have been forged; it is then no novelty; it is an essential doctrine of Christianity, and as such the Catholic world receives it. In a word, therefore, does the Catholic world *now* admit the infallibility of the Church, because it has been uniformly handed down as a revelation. The

race of men who have taught us, taught us what they had received, as a revelation of Jesus Christ, from their fathers, and thus the line of witnesses can never end till it reaches Jesus Christ. There has been then, in every age, from the Apostolic days, an uninterrupted body of testificators who have delivered, and of witnesses—themselves destined to be eventually testifiers—who have received, the doctrine in debate, as well as those other articles of faith, to which I have already directed the reader's attention, namely, the incarnation of Christ, the establishment of the Church, and the inspiration of the sacred writers of the New Covenant. Reject this mass of authority and Christianity is undone. Not even Christ's existence can be established without it; and His divinity, and the divinity of the sacred writings, will remain unproved, if such extrinsic evidence can be rejected. There is not a fact of history, there is not any merely literary or scientific truth as firmly based, as the truth under investigation; for what merely historic fact is there, what truth connected with science and literature, to which two hundred millions of individuals of every nation, tongue, and people testify, in the same unhesitating and decided manner as the millions of Catholics scattered over the world, testify to the infallibility of the Church? If human testimony, then, can make us cognizant of facts, if circumstances can tend to confirm and strengthen the evidences of truth, then were it madness to deny the infallibility of the Church: for of all facts, this is palpably the most important, and it is established by the evidence of millions of every age. "Ipsa sola Ecclesiæ Catholicæ auctoritas argumentum est majoris ponderis, quam alia quævis ratio, quia credendum judicamus quidquid maxime et vitam et societatem hu-

manam dirigit ac conducit."[1] On this testimony, St. Augustine completely relied; and he hesitated not to say, that but for it he would not have believed the Gospel itself.[2] Viewing the Church in itself, and in its evidences, this most learned convert to the Church observes: "There are many other things (besides the heavenly wisdom of the Church) which most justly keep me in her bosom. The AGREEMENT of peoples and of nations keeps me. Authority, begun with miracles, nourished with hope, increased by charity, strengthened by antiquity, keeps me. The succession of priests from the see itself of the Apostle Peter—to whom the Lord, after His resurrection, committed His sheep to be fed—down to the present episcopacy, keeps me. Lastly, the very name of the Catholic Church, keeps me; a name, of which, in the midst of so many heresies, this Church alone has, not without reason, so kept possession, that though all heretics wish themselves to be called Catholics, yet to the enquiry of any stranger, 'Where is the meeting of the Catholic Church held?', no heretic dares to point out his own basilica or house."[3] Assuredly, Augustine, the Bishop of Hippo, and Thomas Joseph, the Bishop of Menevia and Newport,[4] are of the same mind: both speak alike, in respect to the authority and infallibility of the Church; both, alike, shrink with horror from the supposition that the

[1] R. H. on Infallibility, p. 28, Ed. 1687. I believe that *Abraham Woodhead* is the author of the work referred to; at all events, the language, arguments, &c. are like his.

[2] Ego vero Evangelio non crederem, nisi me Catholicæ Ecclesiæ commoveret Auctoritas. *Contra Epist. Manichæi fundam.*, t. viii, n. 5, 6.

[3] Ibid.

[4] See his Lordship's truly learned letters in answer to Bailey, passim. Ed. 1852.

Church of the living God may become apostate, and may, instead of professing Christ's creed, set up some idol of Gentilism for the adoration of her followers. The declaration of the Homilies is unphilosophical; it is worse, it is absurd. It is the cry of desperation; it is the straw which the drowning man grasps, in order to escape from shipwreck; it is the "stop-thief" of the plunderer, who raises the cry in order to escape exposure; it is the perversion of the text, *Expedit ut unus moriatur ne tota gens pereat:* the fautors of fallibility would read the text thus: *The nations of the earth must perish, in order that one may survive.* Condemned, utterly rejected by the entire of Christendom, the new establishment was placed in this dilemma; it was either obliged to denounce a world or to denounce itself. It chose the hazardous and suicidal act of denouncing the world; but in doing so, it seems to have forgotten that there was a world to laugh at the foolish act, and that whilst it proclaimed its own fallibility, it published its own worthlessness, as a system of divine faith.

From the records of the New Testament, which were written after the Church had been planted and spread to a considerable extent, and which, as we shall hereafter demonstrate, are proved to be authentic, genuine, and inspired by that very same principle of authority, which we have alleged in favour of the inerrancy of the Church, the truth, which we have been endeavouring to prove, may be easily established. I do not say that the texts are abstractedly so clear as to carry conviction along with them, or are so worded as to force every one to interpret them in one way, and one only; for, in fact, what one passage is there in the Scriptures, which is not open to

misinterpretation? If the Calvinist and Lutheran differently interpret the plain words, "this is my body," do not the Socinians and Protestants differ about the meaning of an equally clear phrase—"the Word was made flesh"? But what I do fearlessly assert is this; 1° That neither clearer phraseology, nor more numerous texts, can be adduced in favour of any truth, than are to be found in the pages of the New Testament, in testification of the Church's inerrancy; and 2° That every evasion of the one meaning of the several passages of Scripture which we are about to adduce, may be turned by the infidel and dissenter with terrific effect against the whole system of Anglicanism.

The things of the spiritual world, as well as the objects of the world around us, to be seen, require some heavenly light. Without light, the outer world is a blank; things are as if they were not. But let the sun shed its rays around, and what a world of beauty and of loveliness, and of endless variety, appears before us. It is indeed the same world as was shrouded in darkness, but it was not seen, it was not made manifest before the sun's light illumined it. So it is too, to a great extent, with another work of God—the book of Revelation. Without the light of faith, there is darkness there, and God's work appears empty and void: forms are undefined, precious treasures are unseen, and the heavenly handwriting is shrouded in mystery. But shed on that book the heavenly light; let the reader be illumined, and then,—then all will appear wonderful: God's wisdom, and providence, and liberality manifesting themselves at every turn. The Anglican searches for the light: *the Catholic has it.* Whilst the former suspends his assent on principle, until he has be-

come acquainted with at least the letter of the Scriptures, the latter, like those whom the Apostles instructed, and to whom, eventually, but long after their conversion, were committed some inspired writings, reads the Scriptures already believing. This belief lights him on his road. He already knows what the revelations of Christ are, and hence in each page he readily detects, sometimes references to, and principles of faith, whilst at other times, he finds the doctrines of his religion expressed in language, the clearest and the most emphatic. As instances, in point, I will draw the reader's attention to the following passages of Holy Writ.

First, then, what is the description which our Saviour gives of the Church which he was about to establish? Is it of a building which is badly founded, and which is quickly to pass away—hurled down by the fury of conflicting elements? No. The building is founded upon a rock: "On this ROCK I will build my Church."[1] The Church's foundations are not laid upon sand; for had they been, when the winds blew, and the rains fell, and the floods came, the fabric would have fallen; but they are based upon a rock, in order that when "the rains fell, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and they beat upon that house, it might not fall."[2] The builder was indeed *the wise one* of the Gospel, and his work was to give evidence of his wisdom. Nor was our Saviour content with emphatically declaring, "I will build my Church upon *this rock*," he distinctly promises that his Church shall not be overthrown: "the gates of hell," he adds, "*shall* NOT *prevail against it.*"[3] The promise is absolute;

[1] S. Matthew, xvi, 18. [2] Ibid. vii, 25, 27.

[3] *C'est à dire, que l'Eglise ne périra jamais.* Beausobre, Nouveau Test.

and the existence of the Catholic Church, notwithstanding all the defections and trials of eighteen hundred years, is the standing proof of the wisdom and power of him who made the promise. It exists, not in decay, not as a mere antique; but it exists full of life, and full of youthful vigour. "The Catholic Church," as Macauley observes, "is still sending forth, to the farthest ends of the world, missionaries, as zealous as those who landed in Kent with Augustine, and still confronting hostile kings, with the same spirit with which she confronted Attila. The number of her children is greater than in any former age. Her acquisitions in the New world have more than compensated for what she has lost in the Old. Her spiritual ascendancy extends over the vast countries which lie between the plains of Missouri and Cape Horn, countries which, a century hence, may, not improbably, contain a population as large as that which now inhabits Europe. The members of her communion are certainly not fewer than a hundred and fifty millions, and it will be difficult to show that all other Christian sects united amount to a hundred and twenty millions. Nor do we see any sign which indicates that the term of her long dominion is approaching. She saw the commencement of all the governments, and of all the ecclesiastical establishments that now exist in the world; and we feel no assurance that she is not destined to see the end of them all. She was great and respected before the Saxon had set foot on Britain, before the French had passed the Rhine, when Grecian eloquence still flourished in Antioch, when idols were still worshipped in the Temple of Mecca: and she

vol. i, p. 70, in l. Ed. 1741. For the meaning of the words "gates of hell," see Rosenmüller, in l.

may still exist in undiminished vigour, when some traveller from New Zealand, shall, in the midst of a vast solitude, take his stand on a broken arch of London Bridge to sketch the ruins of St. Paul's." "Four times, since the authority of the Church of Rome was established in Western Christendom, has the human intellect risen up against her yoke. Twice that Church remained completely victorious. Twice she came forth from the conflict bearing the marks of cruel wounds, *but with the principle of life strong within her.* When we reflect on the tremendous assaults which she has survived, we find it difficult to conceive in what way she is to perish." [1]

Ye winds and rains, ye proved her; yet she stands.

Yes, the Church stands; *why* or *how*, the wisest separatists cannot tell. She *ought* to have perished, but she has not —she exists, strong and full of vigour. Why this is, the Catholic only can tell; the Catholic child may teach the puzzled historian and philosopher a lesson. One word explains the whole mystery: the Church is, because *Christ founded her on the rock, and promised, that not even the mightiest power*, the power of infuriated demons, *should prevail against her.* Such is the plain word of Scripture—plain to the enlightened—relative to the establishment and perpetuity of the Church. When Christ actually sends forth his Apostles, to build up the Church on the rock which he himself had selected, as the basis, the foundation of the heavenly structure, his words are equally clear and emphatic: "All power," he says, "is given to me in heaven and in earth. Going *therefore, teach* (μαθητεύσατε) *all nations*, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and

[1] Review of Ranke's History of the Popes, pp. 4, 5, 10, 11, Ed. 1851.

of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; *teaching* (διδάσκοντες) *them to observe all things, whatsoever I have commanded you; and, behold, I am with you all the days, even to the consummation of the world.*" The ministerial line has begun; it has been sent forth by him who is omnipotent; it has been sent forth to teach authoritatively all the nations of the earth. The task is an arduous one, but the teachers are cheered by the assurance that *he* who has all power in heaven and in earth, *will be with them.* This word strengthened Isaac during his sojourn in Gerara,[2] and secured to Moses God's assistance, when sent forth on his arduous task of confronting Pharaoh, and leading the Israelites through the wilderness;[3] as it also did to Moses' successor, Josue;[4] it cheered the ever Blessed Virgin, when an angel announced his important mission;[5] and now it gives confidence to the Christian minister. Not for a short while is this assistance promised, it is promised "*for every day,*" ἐγὼ μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας, "*even to the end of time.*" Then shall all the nations of the earth have been evangelized, and when this has been done, time shall be no more. Every word bears out the one idea of Christ, expressed in his promise: interpret the passage thus, and all is consonance; affix another interpretation, and Christ's rock is only a quicksand, and his promise of unceasing assistance, an idle boast. If he has not promised to guard, support, secure his Church

[2] Genesis xxvi, 2, 3.

[3] Exodus iii, 11, 12, and Deut. xxxi, 7, 8.

[4] Josue i, 5, 9.

[5] Luke i, 28. The phrase, *I am with you*, uniformly signifies a promise of efficacious assistance. Cf. Genesis xxxi, 3, 5; xlvi, 3, 4; Jeremias i, 17, 19; Acts xviii, 9, 10; and the passages referred to in notes 2, 3, 4, 5.

for ever, in the words adduced, in vain shall we search for any doctrinal statement, in any other words of Christ: the Trinity in Unity, as well as the procession of the Holy Spirit, and the consubstantiality of the Son, will assuredly remain without so much as the shadow of a proof. To return to our text. The words of our divine Saviour, as interpreted, contain the verification of former prophecies. When the angel described the characteristics of the Messias, he used the following language: "He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Most High, and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of David his father, and he shall reign in the house of Jacob *for ever: and of his kingdom there shall be no end.*"[1] These words are little more than a repetition of the prophecy of Daniel: "The stone that struck the statue became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth. But in the days of those kingdoms, *the God of heaven will set up a kingdom that shall* NEVER *be destroyed, and his kingdom shall not be delivered up to another people:* and it shall break in pieces and shall consume all these kingdoms, *and itself shall stand for ever.*"[2] "I beheld, therefore, in the vision of the night, and lo! one like the Son of Man came with the clouds of heaven, and he came even to the Ancient of days, and they presented him before him. And he gave him power, and glory, and a kingdom: and all peoples, tribes and tongues shall serve him: *his power is an everlasting power, which shall not be taken away, and* HIS KINGDOM, THAT SHALL NOT BE DESTROYED."[3] And all that the prophets foretold, has been further confirmed by St. Paul. Contrasting, in his Epistle to the Hebrews, the

[1] Luke, i, 31, 33. [2] Ibid. ii, 35, 44.
[3] vii, 13, 14; Cf. Michæas iv, 6, 7.

Levitical priesthood, and the priesthood of our Redeemer, according to the order of Melchisedech, the Apostle says: "And the others indeed were made many priests, because, by reason of death, they were not suffered to continue: but this, *for that he continueth for ever, hath an everlasting priesthood.*" "The law maketh priests who have infirmity: but the word of the oath after the law, a *Son perfect* FOR EVER."[4] The Levitical law passed; but such was not to be the character of the Christian dispensation: its priesthood and its sacrifice were to be perpetual, and *a Son perfect for ever*, was to confer unceasing honor on the law of his own institution.

Nor did Christ promise only his own directing grace to the Church, he conferred on it another privilege. "I will ask the Father, and he shall give you another Paraclete, that *he may abide with you for ever*," and this Paraclete he calls emphatically the *Spirit of truth*.[5] Thus for ever, is the Spirit of truth to inspire the ministerial line. Aided by his influence, the minister shall enunciate the truth for ever. No day shall come when this Spirit shall not be with his ministers; no day then shall arrive, when the Gospel shall not be taught, taught in its entirety, even as Christ originally commanded, and to ensure which his own and the Holy Spirit's presence is pledged for ever. The promise is plain; the power of the promiser is acknowledged; the end of this promise, the continuance of truth in the Church for ever, is likewise manifest: who then shall dare to gainsay his word which is to last for ever? When Christ then says that he is for ever with his Church, who shall say that his Church *is not;* when Christ assures us that *the Spirit of truth* abides with the Church, who

[4] Heb. vii, 23, 24, 28. [5] John xiv, 16, 17. Cf. xvi, 13.

shall assert, that not the Spirit of truth is there, but a damnable, idolatrous spirit? When Christ assures us that the gates of hell shall *not* prevail against his Church, who shall deny his words and exclaim, they have prevailed, they have prevailed for eight hundred years and more: during that length of time, the whole world was plunged in damnable Idolatry? And indeed, when we find Christ identifying himself with the teachers, and saying—"*he that heareth* YOU, *heareth* ME; *and he that despiseth* YOU, *despiseth* ME,"[1] and further remember what we have already adduced from the sacred Gospels relative to the continuity of the line once commenced of ministers, is it not manifest that such a representative body, cannot possibly teach otherwise than in accordance with the revelations of Jesus Christ. Therefore, according to St. Paul, God gave to the Church various orders of ministers—"apostles, evangelists, pastors, doctors and prophets,—that henceforth we be no more children tossed to and fro, and carried about by every wind of doctrine by the wickedness of men, by cunning craftiness by which they lie in wait to deceive."[2] What if the ministry of the Church could have erred; what if the body of the pastors of the Church could have gone astray; so far from their being useful, they would have been a curse to the world. By their errors they would have easily misled mankind, and plunged the mass into the deepest sink of moral and religious degradation. If there had not been a heaven-secured ministry at the commencement of the Church, St. Paul could not have absolutely said "remember your prelates who have spoken the word of God to you; *whose faith follow*"[2]—nor could St. John have stated that the mode of trying if the spirits were of

[1] Luke x, 16. [2] Eph. iv, 11, 14.

God, was to see if people heard the Apostles. "Dearly beloved, believe not every Spirit, but try the Spirits if they be of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world. We are of God. *He that heareth God heareth us. He that is not of God, heareth us not. By this we know the Spirit of truth and the Spirit of error.*"[3] A test of truth was required from the very commencement of the Church, and the test was, obedience to and belief in the ministry. A similar test would be still more requisite when the Church had spread itself over the nations of the earth, and had, in the midst of the errors of Gentilism and the false teachings of those who had forfeited the faith, to make the one revelation manifest. The discriminative characteristic continued unchanged, and thus Christians were guarded against the innovations of heresy, and morally secured from being carried about by every breath of doctrine by the wickedness of men, by cunning craftiness by which they lie in wait to deceive. Thus again, the Church well deserved the designation of "the pillar and support of truth."[4] It was easy to know who heard and who refused to hear the divinely appointed ministerial body; it was as easy formerly as now: and this known, the difference of truth and error was at once manifest. It was known who was and who was not a professor of the one faith which Christ and the Apostles had taught. The Church and its enemies stood forth in open antagonism.

And now, to examine still more closely, the grounds of the Reformation, the position taken in the Homilies and involved in the very idea of a reformation such as was carried out here in the sixteenth century, to wit, that the world had lost the faith once delivered by a cloud of wit-

[3] 1 John iv, 1, 6. [4] 1 Tim. iii, 15.

nesses and had become idolatrous; I would ask, what does history state, what do the very stones say, what do all the Churches of the world which profess the old faith declare, relative to the belief of the Catholic Church during those eight hundred years of supposed apostacy? We will date these years from 734 to 1534. During this period the idols of Germany were hurled down, and through that wild and wide extent of territory was spread the faith of Jesus Christ. Men, at the teaching of Boniface,[1] and Burchard, and Lullus, and Willibald, and Wenebald, and Wigbert, not to name scores of others of our sainted countrymen who engaged in this noble undertaking, renounced idolatry in every form; and those who formerly had called upon Thor and Woden as divinities, thenceforth adored one only true and living God, and no more. The writings of several of these missioners, as of Boniface and Lullus, are still extant: they breathe only one desire, and that desire is to see God's holy name honored and adored; and they express joy only at one occurrence, at the conversion of the Idolater. In the eighth century, Saxony and Friesland were converted at the preaching of Luidger, and of St. Willehad.[2] This zeal for Christ was enduring. In the next age, the Sclavonians were converted by SS. Cyril and Methodius;[3] the Bulgarians, Moravians and Bohemians

[1] See Boniface's Letters, as also those of Gregory III, especially Ep. 46. The Saint's real name was Winfrid. He was born at Kirton in Devonshire, A.D. 680.

[2] See his Life, written by Alfrid, and published *in the second volume of Pertz's Monumenta;* and the Life of Willehad by Anschar, Archbishop of Hamburgh, l. c.

[3] For a history of these zealous brothers, see *Acta Sanct.*, die 9 Martii, as also Assemani, Kalendaria Ecclesiæ universæ, t. iii, p. 175;

joyfully yielded to the preaching of the missioners just named, and of Adalbert and Paul, sent to them by Nicholas I; and the Danes and Swedes at the voice of Anschar, and Ebbo, and Rembert, embraced the saving truths of Christianity.[4] Further, when Vladimer embraced Christianity,—in which step he was joyfully followed by the people over whom he ruled,—towards the close of the ninth century, his first act after his return to his country was to destroy the idols which he had formerly adored, and toss the broken fragments into the Dneiper.[5] Then did the idol disappear in the Northern countries, and where it had been, was hoisted the banner of the Cross. This banner proclaimed Christ to be, "*the power and the wisdom of God.*" Equally successful was the zeal of the Catholic missioners in the tenth age. Owing to the heaven blessed toils of Adelbert of Prague,[6] Wolfgang and Radla, Christianity was spread among the Hungarians about the year 970, as it was too, nearly at the same period, among the inhabitants of Poland. In 965 Duke Miecislaw, the first Polish king, became a Catholic,[7] and in proof of his sincerity dismissed the seven wives whom he had married whilst yet an infidel. The Poles followed the example of their Sovereign, and in testification of their zeal for the law

Dobrowsky's Essay on these Saints, p. 71; and the Letters of Pope John VIII, apud Hardouin *Concil.*, vol. vi, p. 61, &c.

[4] Histoire de Dannemarc, p. 54, par La Combe. See also Rimbert's Life of Anschar, c. 13. We are told that Anschar was inspired to exert all his efforts in favour of the Danes.

[5] La Combe's Histoire de Russie, p. 406.

[6] See *Acta SS.* die 23 Aprilis, c. vi, p. 192, relative to the toils and successes of St. Adelbert among the Hungarians.

[7] La Pologne adoroit pour lors les dieux du Paganisme, dont le culte fut aboli. La Combe's Histoire de Pologne, p. 376.

of Jesus Christ, introduced the custom which for ages they uniformly observed, of partly unsheathing their swords, at the reading of the holy Gospels during the celebration of the Mass. The son too of the mighty Eric, surnamed the Victorious, Oloff II, embraced the faith, and at the preaching of Sigafrid, Grimkil and David, both Swedes and Norwegians, abandoned the gods of their fathers, and openly professed Christianity in the eleventh century.[1] Europe, once the seat of idolatry of the most degrading character, wondering and blessing, found itself at last nearly Christian, in consequence of the zeal of missioners sent forth by apostolic men, like Gregory the Great and his successors in the Roman See, Gregory III and IV, Leo IV, Nicholas I, John VIII, &c. Eskill and Ulfrid, and Boniface of Camaldoli, continued the work of conversion in the North in the eleventh century; and in the twelfth St. Henry was seen toiling in Finland; and in Pomerania St. Otho, commissioned by Honorius II, succeeded in extending the faith of Jesus Christ; whilst Nicholas Breakspear, himself destined on some after day to be raised to the dignity of Christ's Vicegerent on earth, became an Apostle to the inhabitants of Norway. Thus was the work of conversions continued. The work of conversion was as actively prosecuted in the century of Apostacy, as in any previous age: then was India evangelized; Japan embraced the faith, and China was instructed by the Christian missioner. And later history is full of facts connected with the conversions of North and South America, of Brazil, and of a thousand Islands once inhabited by men of blood; of Savages whose instincts seemed to be destructive of the very idea of Christianity. In the lands just

[1] Histoire de Suede, p. 30.

named more were converted to the one faith by the zeal of a few individuals, than had been perverted by the human systems of Luther, Calvin, and Henry VIII, notwithstanding the rigours of the olden creed when compared with the sensualism and lawless tendencies of the modern religions.

Is this the way to spread idolatry? Is this the proof which the Catholic Church has given to the world of her adoration of the creature and rejection of God? Wherever she appeared idols fell, altars sacred to false deities were overturned, and the priesthood of Jupiter and Venus, Woden and Thor, became extinct. Consult the history of Japan and you will discover that the idols Brahma, Vichnou and Butzen, were abandoned at the preaching of the Apostles of the Indies, St. Francis Xavier[2] and his Companions; and that those who had once been the professors of Gentilism died with readiness in the cause of Jesus Christ. America will give the same report. The Algonquins whose God was Manithou, the Caraebecs who adored Cheonien, the Hurons whose principal divinity was Okki or Ares-Koui, not to speak of numerous other tribes who adored the *Sun* and a multiplicity of creature gods, will testify to the same fact:[3] that then did they turn to the living God, *when missioners from Rome* visited them and taught them the saving truths of the Gospel. Then did the idol disappear, and the Eternal One become the only object of adoration. The Moluches, Taluhets, Diuihets, Tehuelhets, and other inhabitants of Patagonia who

[2] See Pere Charlevoix's History of the Church of Japan, vol. i, 76, &c., Bouhour's "*Xavier*" *passim*.

[3] See Pere Lafitau's Mœurs des Sauvages Ameriquains, *passim*, and Robertson's India.

adored a good and an evil principle, the former called Toquichen, and the latter Huecuvu, were taught by the Jesuit missioners that there was one God only to be adored, and at their preaching numbers were brought over to the faith.[1]

Ask the numerous nations which embraced or perpetuated the faith of Rome, during the eight hundred years consigned by the book of Homilies to idolatry, if idolatry was inhibited by the missioners sent from, or in communion with Rome, and they will reply—yes. Ask them further, if any creature was allowed to be adored—if any one was to be adored, save the Eternal God; and they will return an indignant *no*. Ask them, if the Catholic Church tolerated idolatry in any form; and they will wonder at the assurance or the wilful insolence of the interrogator: for were not these principles every where advocated, 1° That there is but one God; 2° That God alone is to be adored; and 3° That to give to any creature whatsoever the adoration which is due to the one God, is the worst of crimes. These principles are, they ever were, advocated by Catholicity. Let those who will, deny this statement: the gainsayers will only expose their own wickedness, and their anxiety to buttress in any way a melancholy ruin. From the writings too published by a cloud of witnesses who flourished between 734 and 1534, in nearly every country which had embraced Christianity, we may readily learn what was the faith of our forefathers. These writings may be said to be emphatically religious writings; for in

[1] See the account of one of these missioners, Father Falkner, in his History of Patagonia, p. 114, Ed. 1774. The profession of faith which the Indians were taught occurs at p. 143.

Catholic times the revelations of God and the fortunes of the Church became intimately linked with secular knowledge, as has been correctly stated by a modern writer in the *British Critic*. Now in speaking of the faith of these eight hundred years, is there any *one* author who maintains the lawfulness of idolatry; is there any one who does not positively state that idolatry was destroyed by Christianity? Search the creeds of the Church. Father, Son and Holy Ghost are to be adored as God; this is the *distinct* statement of the middle ages: but where is it stated that the creature may receive this same honor? Study the writings of the Angel of the Schools, Aquinas, whose opinions and works obtained a world-wide celebrity, and you will find him proclaiming idolatry a most grievous crime.[2] Consult the explanations which Bonaventure and Alexander de Ales, not to cite numerous other names, have left behind them of the Decalogue, and you will find uniformly that Catholicity denounced idolatry in every form, and made use of language such as Gerson adopted when he says, "Nos non adoramus imagines, sed refertur honor et adoratio ad imaginatum."[3] Even beneath the images was often found a full development of Catholic belief. I will, though really the task may appear to well informed persons a work of supererogation, transcribe a few lines from Durand[4] in confirmation of this assertion: to Weever I must refer the reader for further particulars and proofs.

> Effigiem Christi qui transis, pronus adora;
> Non tamen effigiem, sed quod designat adora.

[2] 2ª 2æ. q. xciv, art. i, ii, iii.

[3] De Decem præceptis, fol. xxvi, Ed. 1518.

[4] Durand was Bishop of Mende in 1286. The words cited may be found in Britton's Architectural Antiquities, vol. iv, p. 49, Ed. 1814.

Esse Deum, ratione cave, cui contulit esse
Materiale lapis, effigiale manus.
Nec Deus est, nec homo, prœsens quam cernis imago:
Sed Deus est et homo, quem sacra figurat imago.

From this class of petrified doctrinal statements, as well as from that other *Soli Deo honor*[1] which often arrests the eye as it wanders over the noble arches raised by the cowled fraternity, may be gathered the faith of our forefathers, and the folly of the writers and approvers of the second book of Homilies. What again, was the object of the holy founders of the Camaldolese, the Cistercians, Carthusians, Gilbertines, Carmelites, Franciscans, Dominicans, the poor Clares, the Servites, and Brigittins, not to bring before the reader a longer list of venerable religious Orders —what, I ask, was the object of these institutions? Was it not to practise the Evangelical Counsels; to benefit society in every form from a love of Jesus Christ; to present to the world a living, energetic form of Christianity; to testify to all nations how worthy of love was the Eternal God, and how for his sake parents, and wives, and children, and lands and money could be abandoned, and a life of poverty and hardship not unlike that which the Redeemer himself had selected, could be endured? Let the writers of, and believers in the Homilies, call these tens of thousands, idolaters, if they will; but let them do so, after they have shown the same appreciation of the Gospel and an equal willingness to abandon all things for the love of Jesus Christ. The *idolaters* of former days, if such they were, held in higher estimation the teachings and example

[1] At Fountain's Abbey, these words were boldly written in stone over the great arch of, I think, the northern transept. I saw them in the year 1841.

of their Lord, than the so-called *Christians*, who are so loud in denouncing the professors of the olden creed. The former, seven times each day sung the praises of Almighty God; the air became vocal with their praises of the Deity; how often do their accusers pray? When the edict went forth that the praises of God as once sung should cease, did not the worshippers of royalty, those who exchanged the priest for a king, imitate their prototypes in the plain of Dura, and the councillors of Darius who so zealously enforced the decrees of the Medes and Persians,[2] and leave Catholics alone to praise God? The men of the middle ages covered this and every other country with noble cathedrals, and churches and chapels; they raised up the memorials of Christ's love, and of man's correspondence with that love, and these were to be found in every street and market-place and high-road: witness it ye noble fabrics, Canterbury, and Lincoln, and York, and Durham, and Westminster, and Peterborough, and Gloucester, and Winchester, and Salisbury, and Worcester, and Exeter; witness it ye ruins of Woburn, and Reading, and Netley, and St. Mary's York, and Fountains, and Bolton, and Ely, and Chester, and Tavistock, and Tintern, and Shaftesbury, and St. Albans, and Furness; witness it ye spots in England still bearing the name of the Cross, that Cross which formerly consecrated the country and made it holy ground; witness it ye sacred memorials which still exist in France, Belgium, Germany, the Tyrol, and Italy, of blessed Saints, who fought the good fight and kept the faith; and are these and such like men, the architects and builders of Christian temples and of Christian memorials, still to be branded as idolaters? What proofs will posterity find in

[2] Daniel vi, 8, 13.

the railways and docks, and exchanges of this country; in the lions and dragons, and portentous figures of griffins, and pagan gods and goddesses, which have gained admittance into the very churches and chapels whence Christ's blessed Image and the memorials of his Saints have been ignominiously expelled, of the Christianity of the seventeenth and eighteenth century? What evidences will they find here of a self-sacrificing, a mammon-hating, a God-loving religion? If Catholic memorials which exist under a thousand beauteous religious forms, have not secured our forefathers against the sweeping accusation of universal idolatry, surely posterity will have to seek for some as yet undiscovered term, expressive of the atheism of after times, and of a recklessness of every thing, save worldly comfort and accumulation of perishable riches.

Is not even the authorized Calendar of the Common Prayer book, filled with the names of Saints, who lived during the period so awfully denounced by the small section, which originally subscribed the Thirty-nine Articles, and read, by order of Parliament, the Homilies to the people? Dunstan, and Swithun, and the King Confessor, and Hugh of Lincoln, and St. Edmund, are names familiar to every one who has looked into the Prayer book; whilst the churches and the streets of England bear evidence to the traditional sanctity of Saints Ethelbert, Editha, Wolstan, Olave, Laurence, Isidore, Hedwiges, Giles, Thomas of Acon, Chad, &c. And this list might be extended—"even to the crack of doom," did we but wish to show how every other country holds up before us scores of blessed men, illustrious for their sanctity during the eight hundred years referred to in the Homilies. But enough surely has been already written on such a matter

as this; and I trust that this general survey of facts may tend to stop further denunciations of that Church which, during the eight hundred years preceding the English Reformation, preserved the faith as well as the letter of the Gospel. The task of defending the Church of the world against an unfounded accusation emanating from a handful of men,—they were no more who drew up the Articles and the Homilies,—entails more pain than trouble, and is calculated to awaken rather feelings of pity for the accuser, than anxiety for the accused. Were a few of the accused only named; were the reader informed that such men as Egbert and Alcuin, Ratramn and Walafrid Strabo, Florus, Rabanus Maurus, Radbert, Hincmar and Scotus, Alfred the Great, Luitprand and Ingulph, Lanfranc and Anselm, Saints Malachy, Bernard, and the martyr of Canterbury a'Becket, and John of Salisbury—the friend and biographer of St. Thomas—William of Malmesbury, Innocent III, Stephen Langton, Alexander de Hales and Matthew Paris, James de Voragine, Aquinas, Albertus Magnus, Occam, Suso, Thaulerus, Gerson, Pius II, a Kempis, and Picus de Mirandola, have individually been condemned, swept away from the world of Christianity, and hurried by their enemies into the temple of Paganism, there to offer up an idolatrous worship, surely every man of learning[1] would be filled with the deepest indignation. And yet, these are the names of a few individuals only, out of the

[1] Turner observes that "Thomas a Kempis is but one amid a numerous society of congenial minds, among which, none more clearly show the good that was taught, or will more gratify the spirit that loves and cultivates the higher degrees of devout feeling, than the little volume on the *Union of the Mind with the Deity*, by the celebrated Franciscan and Philosopher, Albertus Magnus."—Turner's England during the Middle Ages, v, p. 71.

thousands who could be at once referred to, who, though denounced as idolaters, would have rather spilt their blood than have been guilty of idolatry. How shall we account then for this act of folly, on the part of the assailants of Catholicity? Why they had a cause to support, a system to establish; and who knows not to what lengths partizans go? They had to uphold Anglicanism, and to maintain its divinity; and since this could not otherwise be done—for their system was new and opposed to every thing previously established — than by asserting that the whole world had denied the one faith, the position named was assumed and defended:—in what manner we have already seen. The explanation given by Bossuet of the continuance of Paganism, is applicable to the maintainer of the declaration of the Articles and of the Homilies: "Enchanté par ses Idoles, *il était devenu sourd à la voix de la nature.*"[1] Court favour, passion, avarice, individual interest, all pleaded in favour of the new creed here; and men were too willing to listen to these pleadings. And as Paganism through its leading professors, had recourse to every changing expedient when assailed by the arguments of Christianity, so was it with the professors of the new creed. At first the leading error of the world, was its adherence to Rome. Images were maintained; the Mass was still offered up, and transubstantiation was so fixedly believed in, that the denial of it subjected the disbelievers to the severest penalties. Elizabeth seemed anxious to repudiate the title of head of the Church; not indeed from a willingness to submit again to the papal supremacy —for the Pontiff who had bastardized her had wounded a

[1] See Banier, "La Mythologie, &c." tom ii, p. 267, Ed. 1738, and Bossuet, "Discours sur l'histoire universelle."

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

sovereign's pride too much to expect forgiveness—but from a consciousness of the impropriety of a woman's bearing the title of head of the Church. But during her reign the Mass was no longer looked upon as a holy Sacrifice; it was declared to be a blasphemous fable, and penalties were fixed against those who dared either to offer it up, or even assist at it. There was then, as now, always something to alienate the mind from Catholicity; but that something varied with circumstances. If now, a person should seriously assert, what the Homilies state, that sacred images cannot be kept in churches or elsewhere without the certain danger of idolatry, I imagine that his sanity would be considered in this pictorial and artistic age, in this day of architectural reformation and imitation of mediæval art, is more than doubtful. And yet, this *was* the teaching of Anglicanism; and not its mere teaching: it was made a practical truth, to which ruined churches, mutilated figures, and emptied niches plainly testified. Every change, however, tore the Establishment more and more from Rome; and the more it was severed, the more pleasing it was supposed to be to the Deity. It was a first, a necessary principle of the new creed, that Catholic belief was opposed to revelation; next, that this belief was idolatrous; and since this belief was historically proved to have been the belief of the world for a long series of years, another declaration was requisite: to make England orthodox, a world was given up to idolatry. Such were the downward tendencies of a system which cut off England from the world; destroyed all authority; and nullified the teachings and traditions of more than eight hundred years.

From the general principles and practices of the new religion, specific conclusions were drawn sadly adverse to

the old faith. It was stated in the 31st Article, that the Mass was a blasphemous fable; and in the 28th, that the doctrine of transubstantiation was adverse to the plain words of Scripture; and in the 22nd a similar declaration was made relative to images and the invocation of the Saints. Starting from these premises, it was stated, and even sworn to, by every person who wished to qualify himself for parliamentary, magisterial, or even still less important public functions, "that the invocation or adoration of the Virgin Mary, or any other Saint, and the Sacrifice of the Mass, as they are now used in the Church of Rome, are superstitious and idolatrous."[1] The Protestant was taught that the Saints were not to be invoked, that images were not to be retained, that Christ was not in the holy Eucharist verily and indeed, and that the Mass instead of being the thrice holy Sacrifice of which prophet had spoken, and which was looked upon as propitiatory for the living and the dead, was nothing better than a blasphemous rite. In accordance with this belief, the heaviest anathemas were uttered against the Catholic by the Protestant, and in his zeal the latter denounced in unmeasured terms all who differed from him. To the Anglican this denunciation may be very gratifying, but it proves nothing. If he denounce the Catholic, will not the Catholic denounce him? If he, resting on his own inferences, or the inferences of some others just as fallible as himself, both as reasoners and as biblical expositors, proclaim certain practices of Catholicity idolatrous, will not the Catholic of every country of the globe pity his assu

[1] See the declaration against Catholicity, 30 Charles II, st. 2, c. i, Burns' Eccles. Laws, vol. iii, 17. As also Burnet's Articles, p. 239 and p. 341, where he absolutely condemns Catholics of idolatry.

rance, and return the accusation, but on better and surer grounds, of false worship? The Protestant will be condemned for not *adoring God* in the holy Eucharist, and he will further be branded as grossly ignorant for refusing to honor blessed Saints, but especially the first of Saints, the Virgin Mother of God, whom God himself has so signally honored. He will be told further, that the men who proclaim the Sovereign, and others perhaps not half so exalted or half so virtuous, worthy of honor, can hardly, with consistency, refuse to honor those whose elevation is far above all worldly dignity; and that those who believe that the prayers of sinful mortals may be asked,[2] cannot, with reason, refuse to ask the intercession of the sinless multitude who stand before the throne of God. In fine, he will be informed that the men who bow to the throne of royalty, and on bended knee receive the sacramental bread and wine,[3] and bend the head at the name of Jesus Christ, will not easily justify their irreverence before the images of Christ, and of his Blessed Mother, and of those others who now encircle the throne of the Deity. Nature itself would have answered the Protestant objection, had not a false training obscured the light of reason. Only then are men anti-Catholic when the name of religion is mentioned; at other times they are as decorous and as reverential, and as fond of ceremonies as Catholics themselves whilst in the

[2] See Romans xv, 30-1. Coloss. iv, 3, 4. Ephesians vi, 18, 19, 20. Cf. Genesis xx, 7. 1 Samuel vii, 5, 8.

[3] These practices are enjoined by authority. In the injunctions of Elizabeth, 1559, and in 18th Canon of the second year of James I, it is ordered that "At the name of Jesus due reverence be made of all persons, young and old, with lowness of courtesie, and uncovering of the heads of mankind, as thereunto doth necessarily belong."—Wilkins' Councils, vol. iv, p. 188, 382.

temples of their God. Tertullian's position that every man is naturally a Christian, may be extended. Every man is naturally a Catholic. The principle of authority; reverence for exalted worth; the acknowledgment of mystery, and the necessity of submitting reason to a higher authority, which characterize the true faith, are glaringly conspicuous too in Protestant secular action. Authority—a living teaching authority—is, under all circumstances, appealed to; reverence characterizes every step in society; and dependance on others is a principle uniformly insisted on. Our answer, then, not an individual answer, but the collective answer of the Catholic Church to the railing accusations of superstition and idolatry, is this: "*Ye err, neither knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God.*" We adore one true, living God, and no more; Him we adore in the holy Mystery; Him we adore, and love, and invoke, through His Saints; and Him again we pause to honor, as often as we behold the memorials raised up to remind us of the outpourings of grace on the Cross, or of the reception of grace in the persons of the Saints. If still the accusations be urged, we must answer in the indignant language which St. Jerome addressed to Vigilantius: "Thou dolt! who at any time *adored* the martyrs? who could fancy that a mortal was God? . . . ." "If the apostles and martyrs, while still in the body, can pray for others at a time when they must be still anxious for themselves, how much more can they do so after their crowns and victories and triumphs?"[1] "We worship not, we adore not, I do not say relics only, but not even the sun and moon, not angels, not archangels, not the Cherubim, not the Seraphim, &c., lest we serve the creature rather

[1] T. ii, adv. Vig. n. 6, 7, p. 392. T. i, Ep. cix, ad Riparium, n. 1, 2.

than the Creator, who is blessed for evermore; but *we honor the relics of martyrs, that we may adore Him whose martyrs they are. We honor the servants, that the honor given to the servants may redound to the honor of the Lord,* who says, he that receiveth you, receiveth me." "Christ took upon him earth from the earth, because flesh is from the earth, and of the flesh of Mary he took flesh. And because he walked here in the very flesh, and that very flesh he gave to us *to eat* unto salvation,—but no one eats that flesh, unless he has first adored it,—we have found in what way *the footstool of the Lord may be adored,* and *we not only do not sin by adoring,* but we sin by not adoring."[2] The first Christians were called *Atheists*—"we are branded with the name of atheists," says Justin Martyr;[3] and indeed the apostate Julian, and the vicious Lucian, hardly ever designate them in any other way.[4] Nay more, this accusation was of long standing. Even Tertullian in his Apology, was forced to rebut the calumny. "You say, (he observes) we are atheists, and will not be at the expence of a sacrifice for the life of the Emperors."[5] The object of their adoration was said to be a malefactor; "They make a God of a malefactor, who for his crimes suffered the most dishonorable death; and cursed crosses of wood are a part of their religion—such altars are indeed good enough for these profligates, who worship the gallows they deserve."[6] Nay more, "It is bruited about, that .. they worship the consecrated head of an ass."[7] "Some of

[2] S. Augustin, t. iv, in Ps. 98, n. 9, col. 1520. Paris Ed. by Gaume. The text commented on is "*Adore his footstool, for it is holy.*"

[3] Apol. i, n. 5.

[4] See Lucian's *ψευδομαντ*, p. 828.

[5] Apol. c. x, n. 1.

[6] Minucius Felix, Oct. p. 65, Ed. 1709.

[7] Ibid, p. 64, 141.

you," observes Tertullian, "have dreamed yourselves into the belief, that the head of an ass is the Christian's God."[1] Did the practices of Christianity countenance such statements? Assuredly not. Whence, then, did the accusations proceed? Simply from the most criminal ignorance. And how were the objections met? The apologists showed the absurdity of the statements, declared what their real faith was, and what the object of their adoration;—this they did: it was all they could do. Our course is not dissimilar. We show how monstrous must that accusation be, uttered by a few individuals, which the world denied and denies; and we state that the only real object of our adoration is the triune God. If our enemies will not believe us, let them look to it. WE ARE NOT GUILTY.

And, indeed, have not some of the most distinguished members of the Protestant Church fully vindicated us, both in general and particular, against the horrid and unfounded charges in question? "Let not," says the learned and honest Thorndike, "let not them who charge the Pope to be Antichrist, and the Papists, idolaters, lead the people by the nose, to believe that they can prove their supposition, when they cannot."[2] And hence it was that he openly denounced the Homily on the Peril of Idolatry, and declared that "in this particular, he must have leave to think it fails, as it evidently does in others."[3]

[1] Apol. c. xvi. [2] *Just Weights and Measures*, c. 2.

[3] Epil. 3rd part, p. 363; see too Just Weights and Measures, p. 67. Dr. Heylin, in his introduction to Cyprianus Anglicus, p. 14, seems to have thought much the same of the Homilies as Thorndike. He observes, that "the vehemence used in those Homilies was not against images as intolerable in themselves, but as they might be made in those broken and unsettled times, an occasion of falling. But that people being well in-

Bishop Parker speaks most pointedly in our defence: "So black a crime as idolatry," he says, "that is, no less than renouncing God, is not lightly to be charged against any party of Christians. .... Before so bloody an indictment be preferred against the greatest part of Christendom, the nature of the thing ought to be well understood. The charge is too big for *a scolding word*, and how inconsistent soever idolatry may be with salvation, I fear so uncharitable a *calumny*, if it prove one, can be of no less damnable consequences. It is a piece of inhumanity, that outdoes the savageness of the cannibals themselves, and damns at once both body and soul. And yet, after all, *we have no other ground for the bold conceit, than the crude and rash assertions of some popular divines, who have no other measures for truth or zeal, but* HATRED TO POPERY."—*Reasons for Abrogating the Test*, p. 72-3. "I am pained," says the late Dr. Parr, "by the outrageous invectives that are thrown out against the Church of Rome: and I must further confess, that they appear to me, not only *unjust* but even *inhuman*." "I hope to find a better way of showing myself either worthy to live or fit to die, within the pale of the Church of England, than by insulting Roman Catholics, with the opprobrious imputations of superstition and idolatry."

Nor are less powerful arguments made use of, in vindication of those images which the Homilies denounce, by other distinguished professors of Protestantism. For years, as is evident from the Zurich letters, Queen Elizabeth would not give up the crucifix which stood in her chapel; and when James I was at Edinburgh, he silenced the

structed in the right use of them, images may be still kept for good uses in Churches, and for stirring up of devotion..."

meddling bishops, who would have prevented him from placing religious memorials in his Oratory, by adopting the following language: "You can endure," he said, "lions, and dragons, and devils to be figured in your Churches, but will not allow the like place to Patriarchs and Apostles."[1] This word either was, or should have been, answer enough for the levelling Calvinists. Dr. Parker, in the work already cited, says: "As to the use of images in the worship of God, I cannot but wonder at the confidence of these men, to make so bold a charge against them (the Catholics), when the images of the Cherubim were commanded by God himself; which instance is so plain and obvious to every reader, there being nothing more remarkable in the Old Testament, than the honor done to the Cherubim, that it is a much greater wonder to me that these men would advance the objection of idolatry so groundlessly, and can so slightly rid themselves of so pregnant a proof against it."[2] Still clearer on this head is Montague, Bishop of Norwich. "The pictures of Christ, of the blessed Virgin, and the saints, may be had in houses, set up in Churches; respect and honor may be given to them; the Protestants give it; you say they must not have latria, so say we; you give them dulia; I quarrel not with the word, though I could. There is a respect due to the pictures of Christ and his saints. If you call this dulia, we give it too; let doctrine and practice go together, we agree."[3]

Nor is there less distinctive evidence in favour of the lawfulness of invoking the saints. "I grant," says Montague, "that Christ is not wronged in his mediation. It

[1] Spotswood's History, p. 530. [2] Reasons for Abrog. Test, p. 130.
[3] Gagger Gagged, 300.

s no impiety to say holy Mary, pray for me. Holy Peter, ray for me."[4] Thorndike states, "that all the fathers of oth the Greek and Latin Churches, have spoken to the aints, and desired their assistance";[5] and he adds, elsehere,[6] that "to dispute whether we are to honor the aints or not, were to dispute whether or no we are to be Christians. And whether this be religious or civil, noning but the equivocation of words can make disputable." ndeed, it does not require much mind, to understand the ature of this veneration. As long as "*pray for us*" inolves the idea of supplication, on the part of even saints, long will it be felt that the saints are honored as saints, s holy creatures, but not as gods. Our enemies must onfound all ideas, however distinct,—must ignore the bvious meaning of clear words, to justify the declaration f the Articles and the oath of the legislature. They ust, in a word, prove to the world, that even a primer too deep a book for their comprehension, and that it questionable whether or not St. Paul, as well as all the ncient fathers of God's Church,[7] did not make gods of en. I leave them in the position in which the *odium eologicum* has placed them. Indeed, who has ever read

[4] On the Invocation of Saints, p. 118.

[5] Ep. to Trag. [6] Epil. part iii, p. 353.

[7] Montague, writing on this universal belief, says: "It is the common ice, with general concurrence, without contradiction, of reverend and rned antiquity. .... And I see no cause to dissent from them (the tholics) touching the intercession of this kind. Christ is not thus onged in his mediation. And it is no impiety to say as the Catholics : Holy Mary, pray for me."—*Inv. of Saints.*

Even Luther allows the universality of this practice: "I allow, with the ole Church, and believe, that the saints in heaven should be invoked." *De Purg. quorumd. Art.*

the statement of the catechism of the Council of Trent which is an exposition of the faith of the sixteenth century and of all former times, and can still dare to accuse the Church of idolatry? "We entreat," are the clear words of the Catechism, "the Almighty to confer upon us some blessing; or to deliver us from some misfortune. But since the saints are more pleasing to him than we are, we hence, entreat them to lend us their assistance: and to obtain for us the grants of our requests. For this reason the forms of our petition, on each occasion, are widely different. Addressing ourselves to God, we say to him have mercy on us; hear us. Whereas, speaking to the saints, we merely say: pray for us."[1]

If, as a last support of a worthless cause, stress be laid on certain phrases, such as *worship, adoration,* or other similar terms; or on certain outward marks of respect such as *kneeling, kissing, use of lights,* and a multitude of not dissimilar expressions of regard; and inferences be drawn, irrespective of the avowed and dogmatical teaching of the Church, unfavourable to us,—and on such things as these, Anglican ministers, as well as those committed to their charge, love to dwell,—I would briefly observe in answer to such pitiful objections: 1° That no Anglican would wish the divinity of the sacred writings to be thus tested. In a thousand places, phrases are applied to the Deity which must be explained away; which cannot, consistently with either natural or revealed religion, be applied to God. Is God corporeal? Has he eyes, or ears, or hands, or feet? Is he subject to change, or ignorant? Is he overcome by passion? In his anger does he swear? Is his being limited? and has he to *descend*

[1] *Cat. Rom. Tit. de Invoc. Sanct.*

o see and learn what is taking place on earth? And yet n nearly every page of the Old Testament, words ex- ressive of such ideas occur! How are such expressions o be explained, and *on what fixed, immovable principles re the orthodox explanations based?* Again: if in one lace or more the Scriptures say, "to God alone honor nd glory," do they not elsewhere say, "honor the king" —"honor thy father and thy mother"—"glory and honor nd peace to every one that worketh good, to the Jew irst, and also the Greek"? And if God is said to have een *worshipped*, is not this same word applied in the ery same sentence to the respect exhibited to the earthly overeign—"all the congregation bowed down their heads nd worshipped the Lord *and* the king."[2] In fine; if *doration* be applied to the worship given to God, is it ot likewise used for the reverence given to men, by Abraham,[3] by David,[4] and other holy personages? How hall these words be interpreted? Why shall I say, that he *worship* given to God was an act of divine worship, whilst the word applied to the honor given to the creature nly designates an inferior mode of reverence? Why hall I say that Abraham and David truly adored God, nd that they did not *adore* in this same manner, man? The words are the same, and the prostration was the ame. On what principle am I to explain these words nd acts, and prove an important and essential difference? f I admit no difference; then do I condemn the father of he faithful, and the holy ones of the old law, as idolaters.

[2] 1 Chron. xxix, 20. Our mayors are "worshipful," and the Protestant usband says "*With my body I thee* WORSHIP." Can I justly exclaim, "Thou icked idolater"? If not, why not?

[3] Genesis xxiii, 7.

[4] 1 Kings xxiv, 9.

This cannot be done: it is in direct opposition to what we know of their characters: how shall I then justify the language of Scripture and the outward acts of those whose names I have referred to? A real answer, an admissible justification of the inspired words, will be an answer to the accusations of anti-catholics, and a justification of the language and conduct of the Universal Church.

What Catholic *action* is there which the enemies of Catholicity can accuse of idolatry? Is it *kneeling?* Do not Protestants kneel before the bread and wine of the Sacrament? Is it *bowing?* Do not they bow to the *throne,* at the *sound* of the holy name, to one another? Is it the *light* which is sometimes burnt before the holy image? Are they ignorant that such lights *were* and *are* still burned in the East before statues of kings? and have *they* no illuminations in honor of worldly triumphs, of earthly sovereigns? no *fires* enkindled on the festival of Guy Fawkes — the festival of religious hate and rancour—a commemoration at the recurrence of which, as is well observed by a recent Protestant writer, every Protestant should hang down his head in shame; for it was Protestant cruelty alone, which drove some dozen Catholics almost to desperation. As Chamier,[1] a Calvinistic minister, has well observed, there is not a word or action expressive of supreme adoration, which is not applied to an inferior kind of honor, such as man may exhibit to man, in the pages of sacred Scripture. Language and action are too limited for the full expression of all our ideas and intentions. To interpret these aright circumstances and known belief must be considered atten-

[1] See his words in Hawarden's "*True Church, &c.,*" vol. ii, p. 25 Ed. 1715.

ively. If these be overlooked, we shall assuredly expose urselves to the danger of breaking one of the divine ommandments, "thou shalt not bear false witness against hy neighbour," at the very moment that we are accusing ur neighbour of violating another,[2] which enjoins the doration of God, and forbids the worship of the creature. n elucidation of this question, if further elucidation be ossible, I will translate a passage from a Protestant Encyclopedia,[3] which enters somewhat fully into this matter. 'If Lot," it is said, "prostrate himself before the two ngels who visit him, this is a civility done to two strangers; if Jacob prostrate before Esau, this is the deference hich a younger has for an elder brother; if Solomon rostrate before Bethsabee, it is the act of a son honoring mother; if Nathan prostrate before David, it is a subject ho offers his respects to his prince. But if a man prosrate himself, whilst praying to God, then it is the creature ho adores his Creator. ..... I suppose that an Isaelite has prostrated himself in approaching his sovereign; obody will accuse him of idolatry. If he had done the ame before an idol, this same bodily action would have een interpreted as an act of idolatry. But why? Beause we should have inferred from this action, that he egarded the idol as a true divinity, and that he had owards it those feelings which are involved in adoration, ccording to the restricted sense which this term has in ur language. What then, must we think of what the

[2] See some valuable observations on this matter, in the eloquent and arned "Letters" of the present Bishop of Newport, p. 117; as also ingard's Tracts, p. 108, Ed. 1813.

[3] Encyclopœdie, Ed. d' Yverdun, tom. i, art. *Adorer*. The original words ay be found cited by Perrone, Prælect. Theol. vol. iv, p. 341, Ed. Louain, 1839.

Catholics do in honor of the saints, relics, the wood of the cross? They will not deny that this exterior *cultus* resembles entirely that which they pay in honoring God externally. *But have they the same ideas of the saints and of the cross, as they have of God?* I do not believe that any person can justly charge them with this; and hence it appears to me, that we ought not to denounce them as idolaters. .... If we limited ourselves to saying, that a *cultus* rendered to beings who are really ignorant of that which is done to honor them; that prayers addressed to creatures who are powerless to do what is asked of them, is an unreasonable *cultus*, I should not hesitate to subscribe to this; but I would not accuse the Catholics of idolatry." The whole charge, as Lingard has long ago observed, "appears to be the blundering job of some clumsy workman;"—who this workman was, we shall have occasion to show a little later.—It dies *felo de se;* and a jury may be impannelled to decide whether it deserves the honor of Christian burial."[1]

On the charge derived from the adoration of the Holy Eucharist, I shall only say a few words, because a few words will suffice. We adore the Eucharist, *because Christ the very God is there.* We believe his word; we will not gainsay it, though the Jew and the infidel may ask, "how can he give us his flesh to eat," or may say, "this is a hard saying." We believe before we receive the Holy of Holies, a harder word than this—"*This is my body, this is my blood*"; *we believe in a Trinity; we believe in an eternal generation; we believe in an eternal procession of the Holy Spirit; we believe in the overpowering mystery of the incarnation of the Son of God,* WITH

[1] Lingard's Tracts, p. 251.

ALL ITS CONSEQUENCES: we believed all these things before we fell down and adored Christ in the Holy Mystery. If Christ be in the Sacrament, he is as adorable there as in heaven. God is ever a *hidden* God. He is adored, not because he is visible in his majesty to the eye; not because we apprehend his infinity; but, because *he is God:* wherever he is we adore him; and if, for love of us, he condescend to dwell corporally among us, like the Magi, we will fall down, and present him our gold, our frankincense, and myrrh. His star, ever points out the spot in the temple where he abides; and, under the guidance of that star, we pay our adoration. Christ, I repeat it, we adore; nor more nor less. Were he not in the holy mystery, we should not adore; but being there, his nature demands nothing less than adoration. Protestants deny his presence: we wonder not then, that they adore not. But let not these men teach us what faith is. We have a higher instructer than an earthly sovereign, and a better tribunal than an English Parliament, to guide us in matters of religion. Christ has said, "This is my body," "This is my blood": and the Church, which is the "pillar and support of truth,"—the Church which is ruled and guided by its heavenly founder, and by the Paraclete, *the Spirit of truth,* teaches us what that word means, and bids us fall down to worship, with hearts overflowing with gratitude, him, who is ever in the adorable sacrament; that mystery which has been well called "the generative principle of love," the principle of light, and the heart through which the life-blood of Catholicity flows.[2]

What we maintain, is allowed by the most respectable names which Protestantism can boast of. Bishop Andrews,

[2] See Gebet's admirable work on the Holy Eucharist.

speaking of King James I, says, "The king acknowledges Christ to be truly present in the Eucharist, and to be adored. I also, with Ambrose, adore the flesh of Christ in the mysteries."[1] Thorndike is equally explicit: "I suppose (he says) the body and blood of Christ may be adored wheresoever they are; and must be adored by a good Christian, where the custom of the Church, which a Christian is obliged to communicate with, requires it,"[2] "If Jesus Christ," says Calvin, "be present in the Eucharist, then, no doubt, it is necessary there to adore him."[3] And Beza calls this same Heshusius, against whom Calvin wrote, "an ass," for denying the obligation of adoring the Eucharist, in case Christ were truly and really there. And well might Beza thus designate the man who denied so obvious a truth: all but stupid or irrational creatures must see its obviousness. In fine, Bishop Forbes, observes, that "the sounder Protestants make no difficulty about adoring Christ in the Eucharist. It is (he continues) a very monstrous error of certain rigid Protestants, to deny that Christ is to be adored in the Eucharist, by any other adoration than that of the mind."[4]

From what has been hitherto said, it follows, that the statement of the Homilies, and the only reason which could apparently justify the establishment of an independent and isolated Church in England, namely, the defection of a world from that code of doctrines which Jesus Christ originally promulgated in person, and through the ministry of his Apostles, is nugatory and false. For 1° We have seen that the world could not thus err: this

[1] Reply to Bellarm. c. 8, p. 194.
[2] Epilogue l. iii, c. 30, p. 350.
[3] Calv. contra Heshusium.
[4] De Eucharistiâ.

has been proved from the consentient testimony of a body which could neither deceive nor be deceived, and from the express declarations of our Lord and Saviour. 2° The charge of idolatry we have scattered to the winds: its general absurdity has been shewn at great length, and the specific charges, as well as the general one, we have further seen rejected with shame and indignation, by abler men by far than those are, who still urge their railing accusations. So far from images leading from God, they remind man of him, and force him as it were to remember God's mercy and power; and as for the invocation and veneration of the saints, whilst by the latter act we pay honor to that which is truly honorable, by the former we hurry, as it were, before the throne of the Deity, hosts of praising and supplicating angels, and thousands of "just made perfect." From what we have observed too, in relation to the holy Mystery, it will be clear to every honest mind, that in consequence of it, Christ is being for ever praised and adored. The holy Eucharist is emphatically the mystery of love, and less love than is exhibited by the Catholic, could not be consistently given by the believer in the real presence. The very foundations of the Reformation have been undermined; they have been removed: shall the building stand?

Chapter the Third.

On the Origin and Authority of the Articles of Religion, of Henry VIII, Edward VI, and Queen Elizabeth.

CONTENTS.

Importance of the examination of the History of the Articles.—Their authority in the Anglican Church.—Henry's innovations destructive of Episcopal and Clerical authority, generally.—The six Articles, and works in connexion with them.—These Articles, &c. forced on the people.—The principle involved in the framing of the Articles, destructive of Anglicanism.—Fox and others write against the Articles.—The Articles and religion of Henry are changed by King Edward.—History of the origin, number, nature, and subscription of the Articles of Edward VI.—The Articles mainly formed by Cranmer.—His vacillating character.—Reproached for his changes by Gardiner, &c.—Still, always dogmatical, imperious, and cruel.—Persecution of Mary.—Her firmness.—Articles of Elizabeth; their number and distinctive character.—Reported ignorance of the framers of the Thirty-nine Articles. The Articles are enforced and subscribed.—Review of the changes in the national religion during the reigns of Henry, Edward, and Elizabeth.—These Changes wholly dependant on individuals.—Proved from the Zurich letters.—The Articles are worthless as an authority.—This admitted even by Anglicans.—Observations of Le Maistre on Protestant Articles.—Difference between the origin of the Articles, and the Profession of Faith of Pope Pius.—Justification of the latter.

In the previous chapter, we have had occasion often to allude to, and indeed to cite, the Articles and Homilies of the Reformers. It will be our task now to describe the

origin of the various sets of Articles which were rapidly drawn up by King Henry and two of his children, Edward and Elizabeth, and to see if these Articles have either intrinsic or extrinsic evidence in their favour. The investigation of this matter is of paramount importance. The Articles have been regularly subscribed by the Reformed Clergy of England, and by them, the ministerial teachings have been of course directed. They are the accredited standard of clerical orthodoxy; the doctrines they distinctly affirm, are looked upon as certainly sacred, whilst those which are denounced are consequently considered to be untenable. Guarded by pains and penalties, their orthodoxy was secured, as far as this was attainable by human enactments; and innovation, excepting such as emanated either from the head of the state, or from some popular outburst of feeling, which the state would be found too weak to quell, and to which indeed, for political purposes, the actual government would be forced, as at the time of the Commonwealth, to yield, was rendered impossible.

Hardly had Henry VIII obtained from the Clergy the title of "*Ecclesiæ et Cleri Anglicani Protector et Supremum Caput*," [1] than the Bishops discovered that they had forfeited the power which they had formerly possessed in convocation, for the better regulation of the affairs of the Church. The Commons wishing that "the convocation should be brought down to the same level with the houses of Parliament, and that their acts and constitutions should not bind their subjects as before, ... until they were confirmed and ratified by the regal power," petitioned the

[1] Parker tells us, that Cranmer and Cromwell were the secret advisers of this title, see Antiq. Brit. p. 325.

king to this effect. In vain did Gardiner answer this remonstrance,—in vain did the remonstrance meet with the disapprobation of both houses of convocation; the petition of the Commons was approved of by the Monarch; and the Clergy, who had abandoned their spiritual head, and conferred upon Henry the power which the Roman Pontiffs had formerly possessed, had now to reap the harvest of their own sowing. On the 10th of May, 1532, the king absolutely required of the clergy, through Fox of Hereford, that "no constitution or ordinance should be hereafter by the clergy enacted, unless the king's highness did approve the same, and his advice and favour be also interposed for the execution."[1] Further, it was decreed that the sovereign was possessed of absolute power in settling questions connected with religion. "In consideration that your majesty is the only and undoubted *supreme head, &c.* to *whom by Holy Scriptures* all power and authority is wholly given, to hear and determine all manner of causes ecclesiastical, and to correct vice, &c. may it therefore be enacted, &c.;"[2] and he was likewise made the source, the fountain of all kind of jurisdiction, as well civil as ecclesiastical.[3] The subservient and cringing Parliament, not content with enacting "that no speaking, doing, or holding against any laws called spiritual laws, made by authority of the See of Rome, by the policy of man, which be repugnant to the laws and statutes of the

[1] Heylin, § i, p. 7. [2] See Act 37 Henry VIII, 17.

[3] Rex tam in Episcopos, Clericos, &c., quàm in Laicos, plenissimam jurisdictionem tam civilem quàm Ecclesiasticam, exercere potest, cùm omnis jurisdictio et Ecclesiastica et Secularis ab eo, tamquam ex uno et eodem fonte derivantur."—See *Reform. Leg. Eccles. Tit. de officio et Jurisd. omnium Judicum.*

realm, or the king's prerogative, shall be deemed to be heresy,"—25 *Henry VIII*, 14 c., further declared, "that if any spiritual person or persons, shall preach or teach contrary to the determinations, which, since 1540, are or shall be set forth by his Majesty, as is afore-mentioned, that then every such offender, offending the third time, contrary to this act, shall be deemed and adjudged a heretic, and shall suffer pains of death by burning."[4] The Parliament and the king, or rather the king alone through the Parliament, became the arbiter of religion. By his enactments all were bound; his decrees were as truthful in the eyes of the law, as the acts of councils, or the consentient testimony of the prelacy of the world. They were even more so: for in case the monarch opposed, alone and unsupported, a world, his opposition was to be reverenced, and his decisions were to be obeyed, under the severest penalties. To be sure, a clause was frequently inserted, relative to the necessity of the kingly being agreeable to the scriptural declaration; but such a clause was a clause of course—a clause, in truth, devoid, under circumstances, of meaning. For if the king was supreme judge, and a Parliament was sure to approve of his judgment, and even boldly assert that he was under the inspiration of heaven when he decreed any point, it would never be admitted that the royal declaration was irreconcileable with the Scriptural statement. The monarch's will was a revelation; to question *that* revelation was heresy, and heresy was deserving of death.

Acting, then, on these principles, the king, with the aid of his theologians, drew up some Articles of Religion,[5] in

[4] See 34, 35 Henry VIII, 1 c.

[5] Wilkins, Con. iii, 804, 8, 17, 23. These Articles were published in

which the old doctrines were, as a whole, strenuously maintained. These were ordered to be read, without note or comment, to the people, and against them no one was allowed to utter a dissentient opinion. Nor was this all: having assumed the character of religious dictator, the monarch did not stop here; he commanded the convocation to set forth "*a plain and sincere exposition of doctrine;*" and this was done to the royal satisfaction in a work entitled, "*The godly and pious institution of a Christian man,*" which was approved of and subscribed by the Archbishops, Bishops, and other distinguished individuals, both of the clerical and legal profession, as agreeing "*in all things with the very true meaning of the Scripture.*" The "Institution" was followed by the "Necessary Doctrine and Erudition," which is an amplification of the former work, and was intended, as we are told at the very commencement of the book, "for the institution and erudition of the common people." This work was to supersede the use of the Bible, which the monarch, in the plenitude of his power, had withdrawn from that general circulation which originally he had furthered; and from it, the people were to learn "what to believe in point of doctrine, and how to carry themselves in points of practice."[1] That it might appear with the highest sanction, the king caused an act to be passed in Parliament, "for the abolishing of all books and writings comprising any matter

1536, with the following title: "Articles devised by the king's highness majesty, to establish Christian quietness and unity among us." They approve of the three creeds, and advocate the lawfulness of the invocation of saints, and prayers for the dead, and use of images. Purgatory, the real presence, auricular confession, too, are maintained as formerly.—See *Fuller's Church History*, l. v, p. 216.

[1] Wilkins, l. c. p. 830.

of Christian religion, contrary to that doctrine, which, since the year 1540 is, or any time during the king's life shall be, set forth by his highness."[2] These decrees, thus set forth by royal authority, all Englishmen "were fully to believe, obey, and observe"; and, "if any spiritual person should preach or teach contrary to those determinations, or any other that should be so set forth by his majesty, such person offending the third time, contrary to that act of Parliament, was to be deemed and adjudged a heretic, and suffer pains of death by burning."

The royal writings and ordinances, did not, however, prove as satisfactory to the people or to the Bishops, as to the monarch. He had flattered himself into the belief, that uniformity of truth would result from the publications already named; but in this he was doomed to disappointment. It was thought strange that the prince of Reformers in England should limit the spread of Reform: that he, who had, in opposition to a world, set up himself as supreme head of the Church of England, should refuse to others the right of judging for themselves, and of advocating those principles and practices, which to them might appear most consonant to reason or revelation. And hence it happened, that diversity of opinion was soon seen to spread in many directions, and instead of the one faith formerly professed, England was deluged by a torrent of tempestuous creeds. To obviate the results of unrestrained private opinion,—to stop, in fact, the spread of that very principle which was made the basis of Protestantism—the king commanded a committee to be chosen, on the re-opening of Parliament in May, 1539, to consider what were the differences of opinion which were publicly

[2] Heylin, Hist. Church of England, § iv, p. 23.

advocated, and which were to be rejected, and which held as divine truths. The committee, however, was far from being of one mind. The followers of the new creed of Germany, Cromwell, Cranmer, and the Bishops of Salisbury and Ely, were vigorously opposed by the Archbishop of York and the Bishops of Durham, Carlisle, Bath, and Bangor. It was soon seen that agreement was impossible in the committee. To the consideration of the House, six questions were then submitted, relative to the Eucharist, communion under one kind, private masses, auricular confession, the celibacy of the clergy, and vows of chastity; and to hasten the deliberations of the committee, Henry himself descended into the arena of controversy. Prior to the royal visit, Cranmer had vigorously opposed the ancient faith; with that visit his eloquence ceased. Firm against the decisions of his episcopal opponents, he yielded to the arguments or authority of his king; and all, save Salisbury, who earned, in the language of the times, the character of "a lewd fool,"[1] yielded assent to the following propositions, which form the first creed of Protestantism, commonly called, "The Six Articles," or "The Bloody Statute."[2] 1° In the Sacrament of the Altar, after the consecration, there remains no substance of bread and wine, but under those forms, the natural body and blood of Christ are present. 2° Communion under both kinds, is not necessary to salvation to all persons, by the law of God. 3° Priests may not marry, by the law of God. 4° Vows of chastity ought to be observed, by the law of God. 5° The use of private masses ought to be continued. 6° Auricular confession is expedient and necessary. The title of the bill containing these arti-

[1] Cleop. E. 5, p. 128. [2] 31st Henry VIII, c. xiv, anno 1539.

cles was, "An act for abolishing diversity of opinions in certain articles concerning Christian religion." It was further stated, that the Articles had been agreed upon by the king, and had obtained the assent of both houses of Parliament; and it was enacted, that "if any, after the 12th of July, did speak, preach, or write, against the first Article, they were to be judged heretics, and to be burnt without any abjuration, and to forfeit their real and personal estates to the king. And those who preached, or obstinately disputed against the other Articles, were to be judged felons, and to suffer death as felons without benefit of clergy; and those who either in word or writing opposed them, were to be prisoners during the king's pleasure, and forfeit their goods and chattles to the king for the first offence, and if they offended a second time, they were to suffer as felons." All the marriages of priests were declared void, and "if any priest did still keep any such woman, whom he had so married and lived familiarly with as with his wife, he was to be judged a felon; and if a priest lived carnally with any other woman, he was, upon the first conviction, to forfeit his benefices, goods and chattels, and to be imprisoned during the king's pleasure; and upon the second conviction, was to suffer as a felon. Those who contemned or abstained from confession or the sacrament at the accustomed times, for the first offence were to forfeit their goods and chattles, and to be imprisoned; and for the second were to be adjudged of felony."[3]

Such were the Articles, and such the first code of belief, emanating from a temporal sovereign and a mixed parliament. Henry and his followers did not profess either to

[3] Burnet, Hist. of Reform. vol. i, p. 400-1; and Herbert's Henry VIII, p. 510-1.

believe or to enforce the Articles, because they contained an expression of the belief of former times, or because they were evidenced by the testification of nearly the whole of Christendom at that very moment; but they received them and enjoined obedience to what had been ordained, because they could prove such doctrines to be really divine. The principle of decision was new, though the articles of faith were old. Their antiquity, indeed, would hardly be a recommendation to one like Henry, who had begun a new religion, of which he himself was the head, and who had formally rejected the dogma of Pontifical Supremacy, which he had lately shown to be "so ancient, that its origin was quite forgotten; and so uniformly admitted, that since the conversion of the world all Churches in the Christian world had been obedient to the See of Rome."[1] The decision was the expression of the royal will, and the result of an authority which was practically supreme. This authority was submitted to by a parliament, which had all along been the Sovereign's tool; and though for awhile a few of the bishops, including Cranmer, opposed the passing of the Articles—the Archbishop had no little interest in doing so, for he himself was married—they at length yielded; sanctioned the act; passed the code of penalties; and eventually inflicted the sentence of death on all who dared to violate the injunctions of the Statutes. Heresy was made dependant on the royal denunciation, as also on the co-legislative parliamentary power. This again was a new power. It was a thing wholly unheard of in the annals of the Church, that an English parliament had authority to decide on matters of faith. As Heylin well observes: "As long as the clergy were in power, and had

[1] Assertio Septem. Sac. c. ii, Eng. Ed. p. 242.

authority in convocation to do what they would in matters which concerned religion, those of the parliament conceived it neither safe nor fitting, to intermeddle in such business as concerned the clergy, for fear of being questioned for it at the Church's bar; but when that power was lessened, though it were not lost, by the submission of the clergy to King Henry VIII, and by the Act of Supremacy which ensued upon it, then did the parliament begin to entrench upon the Church's rights, to offer at, and entertain such businesses, as formerly were held peculiar to the clergy only."[1] We shall soon have occasion to see, how the acts of Henry were despised by his son Edward, and his daughters Mary and Elizabeth; and further, how Cranmer and the parliament repealed the Articles of belief which they had previously ratified, and framed others directly and absolutely negativing those of 1539. Our Sovereigns did not deem it criminal to undo what Henry and his had done; and if prelates gave their assent to the Forty-two Articles of Edward, and the Thirty-nine of Elizabeth, they claimed a right to do so, on the same principles which their forefathers had advocated, when they rejected the Papal Supremacy, and substituted the King for the Pope, and the Six Articles for the ancient Creed of Catholicity.

Fox, the notorious martyrologist, condemns the Articles. "Although," he says, "they contained manifest errors, heresies, and absurdities against all scripture and learning, yet such was the miserable adversity of that time and of the power of darkness, that the simple cause of truth was utterly forsaken of all friends. For every man seeing the King's mind" (the reader will remember that the King

[1] Eng. Reform. justif. p. 41, by Heylin.

had been made the judge of truth) "so fully addicted, *upon politic respects* to have these Articles, to pass forward; few or none in that parliament would appear, who either could perceive that which was to be defended, or durst defend that they understood to be true." "To many who be yet alive, and can testify these things, it is not unknown, how variable the state of religion stood in these days; how hardly and with what difficulty it came forth; what chances and changes it suffered; even as the king was ruled and gave ear, sometimes to one and sometimes to another; so, one while it went forward, at another season as much backward again; and sometimes clean altered and changed for a season, according as they could prevail who were about the king. So long as Queen Anne lived, the Gospel had indifferent success. After that she, by sinister instigation of some about the king, was made away, the course of the Gospel began again to decline, but that the Lord stirred up the Lord Cromwell (!) opportunely to help in that behalf, who did much avail for the increase of God's true religion. . . . After the taking away of which Cromwell, the state of religion more and more decayed, during all the residue of the reign of King Henry. And amongst these adversaries was Stephen Gardiner, who brought the king at length clean out of credit with the reformed religion."[3] Similar is the statement of Latimer, with regard to the fluctuation and uncertainty of religion, after the establishment of the Royal Supremacy and the independent Church of England. "I refer you," says Latimer, "to your own experience, to think of our country parliaments and convocations, how and what ye have there seen and heard. The more part in my time did bring forth

[1] Fox, 1036-7.

the Six Articles, for then the king would so have it, being seduced of certain. Afterwards the more part did repeal the same, our good Josiah (Edward) willing to have it so. The same Articles now again, alas! another greater, but worse part hath restored. O what an uncertainty is this. But after this sort most commonly are man's proceedings. God be merciful unto us!"[3]

Hardly was Henry dead, when the fabric which he had erected with so much pains, was nearly levelled to the ground. The pillar and foundation stone of Anglicanism removed, the building fell; and those who had once helped the sovereign in his arduous task of reformation, were the foremost in pulling to pieces what they had been instrumental in erecting. Henry only abandoned the Church, as his whole history proves, because the Church was *the* obstacle to the gratification of his illicit amour with Anne Boleyn. He separated from the Pontiff to be united to Anne, and that union effected, he thought little of reform. Indeed, his pride of intellect induced him to oppose that reformation, which Cranmer and others well affected to the German reformers, would have introduced. Henry was an author as well as a king. He had written a work against the head of the foreign separatists, in vindication of the doctrines and practices of the Church of Rome; and for this work he had obtained the praise of the Pontiff, the distinguished title of "defender of the faith," and the approbation of the sovereigns and illustrious scholars of Europe. His book was nearly as dear to him as his crown; and the new title which he had earned he was as anxious to retain, as the title of sovereign of the realm. To oppose the olden faith, where his

[3] See Ridley's Works, p. 130-1. Parker, Soc. Ed. 1841.

private interests were not at stake, or to deny what he had formerly so eloquently and logically demonstrated, would have been considered by Henry, as nothing less than self-condemnation. Further, Luther, and Luther's partizans, had not simply written against him; they had used term after term of contempt and obloquy; had addressed the sovereign of England in language unfit for the ears of any street wrangler, so low, so criminatory, so ungentlemanly was it. This the king could not forget; hence his opposition to those distinctive tenets which characterized the German and Helvetic Churches. As has been well observed, "the English Reformation, upon whatever theological grounds it may eventually have been based, was, undoubtedly, in the first instance, a mere political movement."[1] It was not the result of a system, but of circumstances. With changed circumstances, it altered; and as the followers of Luther and Calvin gained or lost influence in this country, so did the popular creed exhibit more or fewer evidences of the effects of the foreign teachings.[2]

Cranmer and Somerset were now at the head of affairs. They, in fact, governed both Church and State; for what could a boy king, only 10 years of age be, but a puppet in the hands of wily and cunning men like the two individuals just named. Whilst the former was well known to be hostile to the six articles, for reasons already mentioned, the latter was devotedly attached to the principles of the foreign reformers. The consequences of the spiritual ascendency of such men, may readily be anticipated.

[1] *The subject of Tract* XC *Examined*, p. 15.

[2] See on this point, Cardwell's Preface to the two Prayer-books of Edward VI, p. 9.

Cranmer availing himself of his favourable position, drew up, with the assistance of Becon—one of the most violent, and assuredly the most scurrilous writer, of the reformers—the book of Homilies, in which he developed those doctrines most congenial to his own feelings and convictions, or the feelings and convictions of the foreigners whose approbation he was anxious to ensure. To have done only this would not have sufficed. He would make the Homilies the standard of orthodoxy; and for this end, they were ordered to be read in every Church on all Sundays and Holidays. Furthermore, to ensure this one form of teaching, no one, not even a bishop, was allowed to preach without previously obtaining either from Somerset or Cranmer, permission to do so. In vain did Gardiner challenge Cranmer to prove the new doctrines advocated in the Homilies, and accuse him of duplicity and tergiversation: he was speedily sent to prison, there to ponder on the effects of resisting the dogmatism of the fickle metropolitan.

But the publication of the Homilies, was only a step in the course of reform planned by Cranmer. The six articles were soon repealed; and the Archbishop looked forward with pleasure to the moment when he might, without let or hindrance, enjoy the society of the woman whom he had forced from his palace, in order to evade the displeasure of Henry, if not to testify his hearty assent to the articles, to which he had outwardly at least given his approval. Priests were allowed to marry;[3] communion was *commonly* hereafter to be received under both kinds; images were ordered to be removed; and the observances of Candlemas-day, Ash-wednesday, and Palm

[3] Wilkins, iv, 22.

Sunday, were utterly abolished. Still, as formerly, the mass was offered up, and the ancient creed was nearly universally professed. This creed was now to be altered; but gradually. To pave the way, and prepare the public mind for greater alterations, a catechism was "set forth" by Cranmer in 1548, "for the singular profit and instruction of children and young people." Notwithstanding many changes, much remained in accordance with the olden faith. The people were still told to believe that "in the communion, the body and blood of Christ were received with the bodily mouth;" and the advantages of confession and sacramental absolution were strongly inculcated.[1] It is not generally believed, that Cranmer himself composed this catechism. It seems to have been originally written in German, and was in all probability one of the many catechisms to which Luther's gave rise, and by which the German reformation was forwarded. Likely enough, the elder Justus Jonas composed it, and it is more than probable that to Cranmer's chaplain, Rowland Taylor, the public were indebted for the English translation.[2] Since, however, Cranmer sanctioned the work by his own name, it must be considered as an expression of another phase of this reformer's varying notions of religion—as "another proof of the slow and painful process through which he arrived at what he conceived to be the truth."[3] At this period, Cranmer was engaged on a more important and more arduous undertaking; an undertaking which was followed by a moral earthquake, which nearly threw down the new

[1] Burnet, ii, 71.

[2] See Blunt's Sketch of the Reformation in England, p. 209.

[3] Blunt, l. c.

fabric of religion, whilst it frightfully convulsed the whole of this and the sister kingdom, as we shall have occasion to show at a future period of this history. The work to which we refer, was no other than the substitution of an English and reformed, for the ancient and venerable liturgy of Rome. It was completed in 1548, and in 1549 was published by authority, and appointed to supersede every other form of divine worship. To Edward the new prayer-book afforded "great comfort and quietness of mind;" and the Parliament, by declaring that the prelates and learned men engaged on the task, had accomplished it BY THE AID OF THE HOLY GHOST,[4] *with one common agreement*, must have felt no ordinary satisfaction at the termination of the labours of the prelates and their coadjutors. But time soon proved either the falseness of the statement relative to the aid of the Holy Spirit, or the wickedness of the reformed Parliament of 1552; for the ritual which had been drawn up "by the aid of the Holy Ghost" was again subjected to alterations; the unctions in baptism and confirmation, the sign of the cross in matrimony, the anointing of the sick, and prayers for the dead, though sanctioned by the first ritual of Edward, were omitted in the second, Martyr and Bucer being on this occasion the inspiring divinities.[5]

The catechism and liturgy being completed, and forced upon the nation, it was time—so Cranmer at least thought, and his foreign advisers, Bucer, Martyr, Melancthon, and Calvin—the combination must strike the reader who

[4] See the preamble to the Act, 1549.

[5] Compare the rituals as published by the Parker Society; or see Cardwell's comparison of the two. Cranmer, Ridley, and Goodrich of Ely, were the chief compilers of the first ritual.

is looking for unity of principle in the English autocrat,—to frame a code of articles. To this, the archbishop then directed his attention, and before the end of 1551 the work was prepared. It was at once placed in the hands of several prelates, in whose possession it remained until the beginning of 1552; and in the following May, the council addressed a letter to the archbishop, directing him to "send the articles that were last year delivered to the bishops, and to signify whether the same were set forth by any public authority." The articles were accordingly forwarded as directed; but we find them four months afterwards again in the hands of the archbishop, by whom they were revised, according, in all probability, to some suggestions he had received from those in power; and eventually they were forwarded to Edward for the royal approval. But other changes and alterations in the original draft of Cranmer had still to be made. The document was next submitted to the examination of some divines attached to the king's household; then it was revised by the primate, and eventually forwarded to the council, with a request that measures might be immediately taken, to authorize the Bishops to compel their clergy to subscribe the important instrument. It was at length published in 1552[1] in forty-two Articles, and before Edward's death every member of the Universities prior to his admission to any degree was obliged to swear to the truth of the new creed, and to promise to defend it

[1] In the Title prefixed to the Articles, they are said to have been agreed upon in the Synod of 1552; whereas the royal letter makes use of these words—"*in Synodo Londiniensi Anno Domini*, 1553." The difference arises from the different mode of computing the ecclesiastical and civil year.

in all places as agreeable to the word of God;[2] and every clergyman, schoolmaster and churchwarden too, was under the necessity of subscribing it. Of what authority these articles were, it is impossible, from want of documentary evidence, to determine; it would seem, however, that they never received the sanction of convocation.[3]

The chief points of difference between these articles and those of Elizabeth, to which we shall soon direct the reader's attention, may be reduced to two: first, discrepancies regarding doctrines; and secondly, occasional omissions or additions. With regard to the first: in the articles of Edward, the Eternal generation and consubstantiality of the Son, are only at the most implied; whereas, in the code of Elizabeth, both these important truths are distinctly maintained. Further, the real presence is very crudely denied in the articles of Edward,—notwithstanding the Bishop's catechism, in which the real presence was clearly advocated: it is denied on the ground that the same body *cannot absolutely* be in more than one place at the same time. In Elizabeth's reign, this *reason* is carefully omitted, and in its stead is substituted the declaration that "the body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner." If Burnet's authority can be relied on, this change

[2] Burnet, ii, 166; Wilkins' Councils, iv, 79.

[3] On this fact, great stress was laid, whilst the agitation caused by Tract XC lasted. Dr. Lamb, in his historical account of the thirty-nine Articles, is decidedly of opinion that "they were drawn up by individuals appointed by the king, totally independent of convocation;" and such is the general belief, I think, of all those who have really entered fully and impartially into the historical question. See the above named able work of the Master of C. C. College, for a full and impartial examination of this subject.

was made, in order to conciliate the Germans, who professed Lutheranism; but others will have it, that the reformers had a still more domestic object in view, to conciliate the Catholics who still formed the bulk of the nation, and to render as indefinite as possible the belief of Anglicanism on this vital article of religion. The obscurity of the meaning of the article has caused much controversy during the last two hundred and more years: its meaning has even yet to be discovered.

The forty-two articles, point out the nature of grace and free will; define what is the sin against the Holy Spirit of which the scriptures speak; declare that the resurrection of the dead is not passed already; that the soul neither entirely perishes nor sleeps after death; that Millenarianism is a fable; and lastly they condemn the declaration of the Origenists, that all men are at last to be saved.[1] The articles containing these doctrines are all omitted in the thirty-nine Articles of Elizabeth. What those articles are, and what additions are there made to the second code, or second symbol of Protestantism published in 1552, we shall have occasion to explain a little later.[2]

A second Reformation was thus effected, differing widely from the first. Cranmer had altered nearly all his principles, not only such as he had avowed in the reign of the despotic father of Edward, but also such as he had openly professed in his Catechism and public ministrations. Justification by faith *only*[3] was now defended; indirectly the

[1] See Articles x, xvi, xxxix, xl, xli, and xlii.

[2] The reader will find in note A at the end of this work, the Articles of Henry, Edward, and Elizabeth.

[3] Burnet was so ashamed of this word *only*, that he preferred rather to falsify the Articles than insert it. See his Articles in l.

doctrine of the Catholic Church regarding purgatory, pardons, invocation of Saints, and the honor given to the relics of Saints and to their memorials, was attacked and pronounced to be "a fond thing vainly invented, grounded upon no warrant of Scripture, but rather perniciously repugnant to the word of God;" the use of the Latin tongue was condemned during the public service, unless some were present to interpret; no Sacraments were admitted as such, except Baptism and the Supper of the Lord; not only was Transubstantiation rejected, but also the real or corporeal presence of the body and blood of Christ in the holy Eucharist; the Mass was pronounced to be a fable and a dangerous deceit; the new Prayer-book was approved of as very pious, and "in nothing contrary but agreeable to the wholesome doctrine of the Gospel;" Edward was called *the supreme head* on earth of the Church of England and Ireland;[4] and in fine it was stated, though it may require no little ingenuity to conciliate this declaration with that of a previous assertion,—that at the resurrection which is not already passed, men will receive rewards or punishments *according to their works.*

The reader need not be told in how many ways these Articles differ from those which Cranmer originally, and till recently, had approved of. His was an incessantly *dissolving view* of religion. His religion changed and changed again, till it became difficult, if not impossible, to say what were his actual religious opinions. Assuredly, in the faith of yesterday there was no evidence of his faith of to-day: with yesterday, yesterday's faith ceased; and the newly adopted creed was as of uncertain duration as any previous one. During Edward's reign, Cranmer had

[4] See Articles xi, xxiii, xxv, xxviii, xxxi, xxxv, xxxvi, xxxix.

solemnly offered up the Mass,[1] and during that same reign he had condemned that Mass, with all that rendered it so sacred, namely, the presence of Christ, and its efficacy for the living and the dead. He had offered up the Mass in the language of ancient Rome, and during it he had shown his respect for the Crucifix, and had invoked the Saints of God, and prayed for the repose of departed spirits; and within a few years, as we have just seen, he was found condemning the ancient service, with the veneration of images, the invocation of Saints, and prayers for the dead, which were all involved in that service.[2] If such a vaccilating character was bitterly reproached by others for his duplicity and changeableness, who will feel surprise? Gardiner, whose practices and belief the Archbishop sought to control, scornfully alluded to the temporizing conduct of the prelate,[3] whom he challenged to the proof of certain doctrines which had been recently imposed on the nation. Bonner called him to his face a notorious heretic, and reproached him bitterly for his subserviency and inconstancy in matters of religion. Even weak women dared to taunt him for his unfixedness of belief: "It is a goodly matter," exclaimed Joan Bocker, whom the Archbishop had condemned as a heretic and delivered over to the secular power for execution, "it is a goodly matter, to consider your ignorance. It was not long ago that you burned Anne Askew for a piece of bread, and yet came yourself soon after to believe and profess the same doctrine for which you burned her: and, now, forsooth, you will needs burn me for a piece of flesh, and in the end will come to

[1] Strype's Cranmer, 144.

[2] See the Ancient Liturgies, as published by the Rev. W. Maskell.

[3] Strype's Cranmer, App. p. 74.

believe this also, when you have read the Scriptures and understand them." Her words were indeed singularly prophetic. Even the Prayer-book of his own approval, the book which was drawn up to supplant the old ritual, and which was forced upon a reluctant nation, even this book, though it was said to have been composed by "the aid of the Holy Ghost," was altered and changed, as we have already stated, to please the prejudices or the orthodoxy of the reformers, Martyr and Bucer.

And yet, notwithstanding this uncertainty of creed, of which the Archbishop offered greater and more striking evidences year after year, the most violent and unwarrantable means were resorted to, to compel both prelates and people to acquiesce in each new form of faith as it first appeared. The Archbishop and the Court, in the very hour of their change, practically claimed to be looked upon as infallible; and punished with incarceration and penalties, and sometimes death, those who ventured on that course of alteration which they themselves were constantly pursuing. It was zeal and religion in Cranmer, and his, to alter; in others it was disrespect and irreligion either to change, or to remain strenuous advocates of, the olden creed. Gardiner was sent to the Fleet, and afterwards to the Tower; Bonner was confined for years in the Marshalsea; and Heath of Worcester, and Day of Chichester, were likewise made prisoners, for not believing in the orthodoxy of Cranmer, and assenting to that form of faith and liturgy which the Archbishop had foisted on the nation. Nay, more, though the nation as a body—for eleven-twelfths of it still remained Catholic[4] and devoted to the old liturgy,

[4] "The use of the old religion is forbidden by a law: and the use of the new is not yet printed in the stomachs of eleven of twelve parts of the

—rejected with indignation the new service, which they called a "mere Christmas play,"[1] and rose up in arms simultaneously in fifteen counties,[2] and eventually in a more threatening manner in the counties of Norfolk, Cornwall, Devonshire and Oxfordshire, in defence of their belief and of their altars, which the reformers would upset, their convictions were not respected. The forty-two Articles of the new ritual were maintained; and it was forbidden not only to keep a copy of any record of the former faith, under the penalty of a fine for the two first offences, and of imprisonment during the royal pleasure for the third transgression,[3] but also to offer up or assist at the holy Sacrifice of the Mass, either in public or in private.

Even the daughter of Henry, and the sister of Edward, was prohibited from worshipping God in accordance with her convictions, and in the manner in which she and all the sovereigns and princes of England had worshipped, for nearly a thousand years. Her head chaplain was tossed into prison,[4] and some others of her household were treated with equal or greater severity. Nor was this all. The princess herself was ordered, as she valued the royal favor, to assist at the service of the new ritual.

realm; what countenance soever men make outwardly to please them, in whom they see the power resteth." *Apud Strype*, ii, Rec. 110. This letter was written by Paget to the Protector, on July 7th, 1549.

[1] Fox, ii, 15.

[2] These counties were Worcester, Warwick, Leicester, Rutland, Gloucester, Wilts, Sussex, Surrey, Kent, Berks, Hampshire, Essex, Suffolk, Somerset and Leicester.

[3] Stat. 3, Edw. VI, 10. For the names of those who voted against this unjust and tyrannical measure, see Journals, 384.

[4] Strype, ii, 252, 256.

But Mary was possessed of an amount of courage and resolution which nothing could daunt, and of a faith which she was determined never to abandon. She declared that she would not obey the royal order, and that rather than use any other service than was followed during her father's life-time, she would willingly lay down her life on the scaffold. Should they endeavour to force the new service on her, she would quit, she said, her home at once and for ever.[5]

But was Cranmer even now settled in his new creed; that creed which he had endeavoured to fasten on the people, and in the carrying out of which design he had had recourse to such inconsistent, cruel, and barbarous

[5] See Archæologia, xviii, 154, 166. Mary's firmness and steadiness in her peculiar circumstances, must strike the thoughtful reader. Nor will he fail to dwell in mind on the effrontery of Edward's Councillors, who dared thus to insult the religion and dearest feelings of the highest subject of the land. What recommendation did the lives and conduct of the changelings of those days carry with them to convince the princess of the orthodoxy of the new creed; or what right had these to force their new religion on the conscience of any one? Apostates from the creed of Christendom, surely they might have allowed to others that liberty of conscience which they had but just claimed for themselves. On the whole, the firmness of Gardiner, who said: "Obedire oportet Deo magis quam hominibus," (Strype's Cranmer, App. 74,) and of Bonner, who told his judges with a firm voice and a nobleness of mien, which proved the honesty of his words, that he had "three things, a few goods, a poor carcass, and a soul; of which the two first were at their disposal, whilst the *last* was at his own;" and of *Day*, who refused to remove the altars in his diocese, on the ground that "his conscience would not permit him," and who further met his threateners by saying that he thought it a less evil to suffer the body to perish, than to corrupt his soul; and of Heath, who declared that he would rather endure deprivation or any other punishment than oppose his conscience by obeying the reformers, is peculiarly gratifying, and bears ample evidence of their sincerity. See Council book, f. 200.

conduct? No. After persecuting others, and throwing the whole nation into confusion, and burthening it with an unprecedented weight of debt, in consequence of the necessity of supporting a large army to quell that spirit of rebellion which the demons of reform had evoked, and adding treason to religious innovation—he had the weakness and wickedness to sign an instrument for depriving Mary of the throne of England—he lived, to prove still further to the world his treachery and dishonesty in matters connected with his sovereign and his God, and to see the fabric which he had raised levelled to the ground; the liturgy over which he had toiled condemned by the parliament, on which he had so confidently relied, as "*a new thing imagined and devised by a few of singular opinions;*" the forty-two Articles of religion entirely repealed; the nation solemnly reunited to the Pontiff of Rome, whom, notwithstanding his oath, he had vigorously opposed for twenty long years and more; and the laws which he himself had framed with so much care, and by virtue of which heresy was made a crime which the State was to punish in some instances even with the severest penalty, the penalty of death, turned against their framer.

Seven times during the reign of Mary, did Cranmer recant and retract his former errors. Suspecting the sincerity of the fallen Archbishop, the examiners condemned the four first retractions, because to them they appeared somewhat evasive; but the fifth was so explicit that it was joyfully received. In the sixth, in which he condemned his previous conduct, acknowledged that he had been a greater persecutor than St. Paul, that he deserved not only temporal, but everlasting punishment, and that he was undeserving of favour, he evinced either a consciousness

of the criminality of his former course of vacillation, or an extent of duplicity lengthened out to the last days of life, unparalleled in the annals of ecclesiastical malversation. He was, he said, "the cause and author of the divorce; he had blasphemed against the sacrament, and had sinned against heaven. He conjured the Pope, the king, and the queen to pardon his offences against them; the whole realm and the universal Church to have pity on his wretched soul; and God to look down with mercy on him at the hour of his death." [1]

Such a man was calculated to disgrace and cast contempt on any cause. But when we remember that Cranmer was the author of the *faith* of Protestantism, *the* individual specially selected to frame the *laws*, the *Articles*, the *Catechism*, the *books* out of which *the people were to be instructed, and the whole Church of England and Ireland was to pray*, we shrink with horror from the sight of such a man, and pity indeed the abettors and panegyrists of such a character. Even on the brink of the grave Cranmer was not sincere. The recantation which he had promised to read prior to his execution, which he himself had transcribed and presented in his own hand writing to a Spanish friar, by whom he was constantly attended at the close of his life, was revoked in his last speech.[2] Then he attributed the past retraction to a hope fondly cherished, that by thus acting, he should obtain mercy from his sovereign. "I renounce and refuse them," he said, "as things written with my hand, contrary to the truth which I thought in my heart; and written for fear of death, and to save my life, if it might be." [3] Obviously Cranmer was unwilling

[1] See Dr. Lingard's *Vindication* against Todd, pp. 95-6-7.

[2] Fox, Acts, &c., 559. [3] Strype, iii, 237.

to receive the martyr's crown. He preferred life, at any rate, to death. He was willing to stultify the doings of a life; to disgrace the party with which he had been formerly connected and which had relied so implicitly on his power, or honesty, or ability; to lie in matters of religion; to pen what his heart abhorred, in order to obtain a commutation of the sentence of death which had been passed on him, and to escape the punishment which he had so ruthlessly and unpityingly inflicted on others. Is such a man to be looked upon as a *God to Pharaoh*, and is his word deserving of the slightest credit? His end showed clearly that what "*he had written with his hand*," in the days of his prosperity and absolutism, might well be suspected to have been "*contrary to the truth which he thought in his heart.*" The desire of pleasing Henry in the first instance, and his anxiety to gratify the German reformers and the Court parasites, whose thirst for the wealth of the Church was insatiable, at an after period, not to speak of personal motives of a still more degrading character, enable us easily to explain the course of conduct pursued by this unfortunate man, and to account for all the changes which marked the entire period of his life whilst Archbishop of Canterbury.

It is now time to say something relative to the present Articles of the Anglican Church, which were published during the reign of Queen Elizabeth, in the year 1562. As the reader has already been told, these articles are thirty-nine in number; and though they differ from those of Edward in several respects, they are however *in general* identical with those of 1552. Which articles were omitted in the Elizabethan code, I have already stated. It remains for me to describe the origin of the Elizabethan Articles, and to refer to the ratification which they

received, and the authority in which they are held by the clergy and laity of the Establishment.

In the beginning of her reign, Elizabeth gave her assent to "thirty-nine Articles, agreed upon by the archbishops and bishops of both provinces, and the whole clergy, in the convocation holden at London in the year 1562, for avoiding diversities of opinion, and for the establishing of consent, touching true religion." The code of Edward had been repealed by Mary; and now the religion of Mary was again banished the land by the laws and articles of Elizabeth. Like all other human things, the articles did not arrive at immediate perfection, even according to the declaration of the English reformers. They were retouched in 1571, and since that period have been made the test of clerical orthodoxy. The articles of 1562 were drawn up in Latin; but in 1571, they were published in English as well as in Latin, and both copies were subscribed by the members of the houses of convocation.[1] The following is a general division of the articles. The five first regard the Blessed Trinity; the three next refer to the authority and number of the sacred books, and the creeds which are to be received and believed; the ninth treats of original sin, whilst in the five following, the important questions of free-will, justification, good works, works before justification, and works of supererogation are agitated. The fifteenth regards Christ's immunity from sin, and man's sinfulness. In the three next articles, the nature of post-baptismal sin is declared,

[1] See Burnet's Articles, in 1, and Prettyman's Elements, vol. ii, p. 34-5, as also Bennet's Essay on the Thirty-nine Articles; in which not only the history of the articles is given, but also a critical account of the minutest discrepancies which occur in various copies of the articles.

and the doctrines of predestination, election, and salvation through Christ only, are developed at considerable length. The characteristics of the Church, its authority and the authority of general councils, are treated of in three other articles. The twenty-second is indeed a sweeping article. In it, purgatory, indulgences, invocation of saints, and the veneration of relics and images, are unequivocally condemned as futile and contradictory of the word of God. The twenty-third tells us who are true ministers; and in the twenty-fourth, it is stated that neither public prayers should be said nor should sacraments be administered in a language unknown to the people. The twenty-fifth and following, down to the thirty-second inclusive, regard the sacraments, the sacrifice, the dispositions required in the minister, and the validity of marriages contracted by bishops, priests, and deacons. The thirty-third shows in what light those should be viewed who have incurred the sentence of excommunication. Traditions and ceremonies; the nature of the homilies, and the authority of the ordinal of Edward VI; the authority of the sovereign, and the rejection of the Roman pontiff; the lawfulness of inflicting capital punishment, and of waging war, are defined in Articles 34, 35, 36, and 37. The doctrine of community of goods maintained by the Anabaptists is afterwards rejected; and in the thirty-ninth article, the lawfulness of swearing under certain circumstances is maintained. Such are the articles of religion professed in the times of Elizabeth, and still adhered to, if subscription be any evidence of adherence, and not simply as some have maintained, an evidence of non-resistence. The leading doctrines of Catholicity were again denied: such as the mass, the real presence, the supremacy of the pontiff,

and the inerrancy of the Church; besides those other doctrines comprised in the twenty-second article, &c., to which I have already drawn the reader's attention, though Elizabeth and her Parliament, and the nation at large, had formerly professed their belief in them. Awful, however, as was the task of framing a fresh code of belief, it seems to have engaged the attention of the houses of convocation for a very brief period indeed.[1] The articles of Edward furnished the materials; these were approved of, or rejected, or added to, according to the humour of the moment, or the convictions of the men engaged in the work of framing the national code of belief. If Neale's statement be correct, the intrinsic value of the articles is low indeed. He observes that the mass of the members of the convocation, to whom the Established Church owes its thirty-nine Articles, scarcely knew how to append their names to the instrument which they palmed on the nation, as divine in its enunciations. This is at least certain: the ignorance of the officiating clergy of England at this period, was absolutely unprecedented. The privation of the Catholic prelacy, as well as of a hundred of the leading clergy, on account of their unflinching adherence to the ancient creed; the suppression of the monasteries and of numerous schools and colleges, wherein the English youth had been formerly instructed in every branch of literature; and the frequent changes of the national belief which eventuated in the greatest civil and religious discord, all tended to dry up the fountain of letters, and stop the progress of education. In the year after the publication of the articles, it was stated by the

[1] For some interesting facts connected with the compilers of the articles, see Heylin's Reform., p. 159, part the second, *ad ann.* 1562.

speaker of the House of Commons, that "the Universities were decayed, and the great market towns without either school or preacher, while immorality was stalking over the land."[1] In 1565, not even a preacher for the queen could be found.[2] Parker, whose authority was paramount at the period of the passing of the articles, writes to Cecil in a pitiful strain relative to the clergy, whom Elizabeth well designated *hedge parsons:* "Take away," he says, "a few of the clergy, namely, those who were specially appointed to preach before her highness, and I take the rest to be but a simple sort."[3] Unimpeachable evidence on this head may be gathered from the private correspondence which passed between the English and foreign reformers, at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign. In the first series of the Zurich letters may be seen a letter sent from Coventry by Lever to Bullinger, on the 10th of July, 1560. Among other things he observes: "Many of our parishes have no clergyman, and some dioceses are without a bishop. And out of that very small number who administer the sacraments throughout this great country, *there is hardly one in a hundred* who is both able and willing to preach the word of God; but all persons are obliged to read only what is prescribed in the books."[4] In the same year, the most learned man of the Protestant party, Jewel, of Salisbury, wrote the following words to Peter Martyr, on the 6th of November: "We are only wanting in preachers; and of these there is a great and alarming scarcity. The schools also are entirely

[1] Collier, ii, 480. [2] Strype's Parker, i, 401.

[3] Ibid. ii, 226. For further instances of this wretched posture of affairs, See Cooper's "*Anglican Church, the Slave of the State,*" pp. 87-8-9.

[4] Zurich Letters, Parker Soc. Ed. p. 85.

deserted; so that unless God look favourably upon us, we cannot hope for any supply in future. The existing preachers, who are few in number, those especially who have any ability, are listened to by the people with favor and attention."[5] Stapleton, who wrote so ably against Jewel, calls the ministers of Protestantism, "common people taken from the high roads and taverns" (*e triviis et tabernis*). Even in Edward's time, the decay of learning was perceived and deplored. Latimer, in the last sermon he preached before the youthful sovereign, says: "I think that there be at this day ten thousand students less than were within these twenty years, and fewer preachers; and that is the cause of rebellion. If there were good bishops, there should be no rebellion."[6]

Still, whatever may have been the extent of the ignorance of these men, or however recently they may have altered their religion, they were no sooner in power, than they claimed obedience from others, who in intellect, learning, and consistency, were undoubtedly their betters. They endeavoured to force the new articles on the nation, and to make doubt and opposition to them a legal crime. It was proposed that "whosoever should preach, declare, write or speak anything in derogation, depraving or despising the said book (of articles), or any doctrine therein contained, and be thereof lawfully convicted before any ordinary, he should be ordered as in case of heresy, or else should forfeit 100 marks for the first offence, 400 for the second, and all his goods and chattels, with perpetual imprisonment, for the third."[7] Fortunately this

[5] Loc. cit. p. 92.

[6] See Latimer's Works, vol i, p. 269; Parker Soc. Ed.

[7] Strype, 282. See too ibidem, 302, and Wilkins, iv, 241.

unjust and insulting act was repudiated by the council. In 1584, which is known in our history as "the woeful year of subscription," the clergy were called upon to subscribe the Articles *ex animo*, as also the Three Articles of the Queen's Supremacy, and the Book of Common Prayer. Eventually every priest was forbidden to offer up, and every Catholic to assist at, the Sacrifice of the Mass. The doctrines of Catholicity and its practices were equally proscribed; and he who dared to contravene the law, soon had to feel the effects of his opposition. Imprisonments, fines, death,—these were the penalties which the Catholic had to endure for following the dictates of his conscience. His creed was as severely interdicted in England in the sixteenth century by the framers of the new religion, as Christianity itself had previously been during the reigns of Nero, Tiberius, Dioclesian, and Maximian.

It may be useful to state somewhat in detail, what was done then and afterwards, to secure assent to the Articles. 1° By Canon V, it was thus ordained: "*Whoever shall affirm, that any of the Thirty-nine Articles....of the year* 1562, *are in any part superstitious or erroneous.... let him be excommunicated ipso facto.*" 2° By the 13 Eliz. c. 12, it was enjoined, that no one should be admitted to the order of deacons, or be allowed to preach, or be admitted to any benefice with cure, unless such person had subscribed the Articles. 3° James I, in the declaration which ordinarily precedes the Articles, published in the book of Common Prayer, says, "that if any public reader, in either of our Universities, or any head or master of a college, or any other person respectively in either of

them, shall affix any sense to any Article, or shall publicly read, determine, or hold any public disputations, or suffer any such to be held either way, in either the Universities or colleges respectively; or if any divine in the Universities shall preach or print anything either way, other than is already established in convocation with our royal assent; he or they the offenders shall be liable to our displeasure, and the Church's censure, in our commission ecclesiastical as well as any other; and we will see there shall be due execution upon them." Further, he "requires all his loving subjects to continue in the uniform profession of the Articles, and prohibits the least difference from the said Articles." 4° By the 13th and 14th of Charles II, c. 4, it was commanded, "that every governor or head of a college or hall in either of the Universities, or of the Colleges of Westminster, Winchester or Eton, shall within one month next after his election or collation and admission into the same government or headship, openly and publicly in the church, chapel, or other public place of the college or hall, and in the presence of the fellows and scholars of the same, or the greater part of them there resident, subscribe unto the Thirty-nine Articles, and declare his unfeigned assent and consent unto and approbation thereof"; and after this the penalties are named for violating this ordinance. Well might Wentworth, as he considered the arbitrary and dictatorial conduct of the bishops of his day, say to the house of Commons, of which he was a member, "Sure, Mr. Speaker, the speech, '*you will refer yourselves to us, as to the agreement, of the Homilies, &c. with the word of God,*' seemed to me to be a Pope-like speech; and I fear lest our bishops

do attribute this of the Pope's canons unto themselves, *Papa non potest errare.*"[1] These words the reader will know how to apply to the regal ordinances. Fallible, their framers acted as if infallibility had been their attribute; and though reformers themselves, and changers in matters of religion, in the widest sense of the word, they forbad others to do what they themselves were so proud of having done, and forbad it under the heaviest penalties. What if they had been restrained by similar ordinances?

In taking a retrospective view of the rise of the three sets of Articles, &c. it will not be necessary to say much with regard to the ordinances of Henry VIII. These were soon rejected, in nearly their entirety, by the very individuals who had framed them, and they are still rejected by the Anglican Establishment. *Henry* would maintain their orthodoxy; and so Prelates, Parliament, and people were told to look upon them as containing neither more nor less than the revelations of the Almighty. They were subscribed, and Cranmer, as well as Henry, *seemed* to believe them.

The period of Edward's supremacy was disgraced by the most flagrant vacillation, and contradiction, and pandering to the wishes of the German reformers. At first, Catholic doctrines and Catholic practices were enjoined; next these doctrines were denounced, and the practices which had been proclaimed in the first Anglican Prayer-book to be sacred, and sanctioned by the Holy Spirit, were eventually suppressed by the framers of the first Prayer-book. Cranmer was the chief mover in the Reformation, and the adviser of the king in matters concerning religion during the whole period of Edward's life, as he had been

[1] D'Ewe's Journal, p. 239.

during the life-time of Edward's father; and we have seen what kind of man this Cranmer was. As we have had already occasion to observe, Cranmer's work was not marked either by sincerity or by a love of religion: indeed, these things were obviously wanting in all that he did. Self in some form was his idol; and to save self, the unworthy possessor of the See of S. Augustine was ready to forswear himself and abandon his God. The admirers of Cranmer may deny this: but those only will be his admirers who have never studied his history in connexion with his perjury on becoming Archbishop, his subserviency to Henry in marrying and divorcing, his violation of his solemn engagement to lead a life of celibacy, his assenting to the Bloody Statute in which he did not believe, his proclaiming the almost divine character of a Prayer-book which he altered, his subscribing a document by virtue of which the rightful sovereign was to be deprived of her throne, and his raising up a religion, buttressed up by Homilies, Prayer-book and Articles, which he was willing to condemn and tear down piece by piece, provided he might be permitted to extend his already too lengthened life by a few months or years. If Christianity had been thus characterized by inconsistency in its origin, it must have been universally condemned, as wanting the first mark of divinity—truth. Reason and revelation would have alike denounced it: this same reason and revelation bid us now repudiate the Cranmerian system. Had Jesus Christ, or rather, had his Apostles, when commissioned to go and teach a world, put up to pull down, and pulled down to put up again, they would have earned, and deservedly, the title of impostors; and are those who did so, at the moment in which they were pre-

tending to reconstruct the fabric of Christianity, deserving of a more honorable name?

As for the Elizabethan code, this being substantially the same with that of Edward, it is deserving of no further attention. It was imposed upon the nation in opposition to the teaching of the olden prelacy, who had been deprived, merely because they could not be drawn away, by the wishes of Elizabeth, from the creed of their fathers—as also of the vast bulk of the learned and pious of the land, both of the clergy and laity. Elizabeth, who had been a believer in the Six Articles during the time of Henry, and a professor of the Forty-two in the reign of her brother, and a Catholic, not only during the reign of Mary, but also at the period of her coronation,—she was crowned by a Catholic prelate during the solemnization of the Mass —was, as her whole history proves, absolute and despotic. Her will was law; and by that will, civil and religious observances were alike regulated. Jewel,[1] in a letter written from London, on the 22nd of May, 1560, gives us an early proof of the queen's determination: "Bonner," he says, "the monk Feckenham, Pate, Story the civilian, and Watson, are sent to prison, for having obstinately refused attendance on public worship, and everywhere declaiming and railing against that religion which we *now* profess. For the queen, a most discreet and excellent woman, most manfully and courageously declared, that she would not allow any of her subjects to dissent from this religion—the religion of a year and a half's antiquity —with impunity."[2] The writer bears evidence too, to Elizabeth's time-serving, and to the reason of the conver-

[1] Jewel had already twice changed his religion.

[2] Zurich Letters, vol. i, 79.

sion of the people. Writing to Martyr on the 14th of April, 1559, he thus gives expression to his convictions: "If the queen herself, would but banish it (the Mass) from her private chapel, the whole thing might easily be got rid of. Of such importance among us are the examples of princes. *For whatever is done after the example of the sovereign, the people, as you well know, suppose to be done rightly.* She has, however, so regulated this Mass of hers *(which she has hitherto retained only from the circumstances of the times)*, that although many things are done therein, which are scarcely to be endured, it may yet be heard without any great danger. But this woman, excellent as she is, and earnest in the cause of true religion, notwithstanding she desires a thorough change as early as possible, cannot however be induced to effect such change without the sanction of law; lest the matter should seem to have been accomplished, not so much by the judgment of discreet men, as in compliance with the impulse of a furious multitude. *Meanwhile many alterations in religion are effected in Parliament, in* SPITE OF THE OPPOSITION, AND GAINSAYING, AND DISTURBANCE OF THE BISHOPS. These, however, I will not mention, as they are not yet publicly known, and are often brought on the anvil to be hammered over again."[3] Still, notwithstanding the opposition of bishops and clergy, notwithstanding the opposition of the numerous members of the Universities, which still clung to the old faith,—"In Oxford," as Jewel says, "there were hardly two individuals who thought with

[3] Ibid. p. 18. The Clergy remained firm in their opposition. Cox, in a letter to Weidner, says, that "whilst of the laity many became Protestants, of the clergy there were none at all."—See *Zurich Letters*, 27 and 39.

the Reformers;"[1] "there is," he again observes, "a dismal solitude in our Universities: the young men are flying about in all directions, rather than come to an agreement in matters of religion."[1]—Elizabeth carried on her work through the instrumentality of her Parliament. Though, as Hilles notices, "nothing had been publicly determined, down to the 28th Feb. 1559, with respect to the abolishing Popish superstition, and the re-establishment of the Christian religion," there was, however, "a general expectation that all rites and ceremonies would shortly be reformed by our faithful citizens, and other godly men in Parliament, either after the pattern which was lately in use in the time of King Edward VI, or which is set forth by the Protestant princes of Germany, in the Confession of Augsburg."[2] This anticipation was prophetic; for Lever was able to inform Bullinger in the following August, how "Popery had been abolished by act of Parliament."[3] Still, though the Queen, for obvious reasons, was willing to spite the Pontiff, she was not always willing to comply with the wishes of the bishops of her own nomination and appointment. By her obstinacy, or slowness of belief, she certainly tested their subserviency. In the first place, she repudiated what her father and brother had accepted and had forced upon a people's assent,—the title of Head of the Church;[4] she retained the crucifix in her chapel, notwithstanding the reasonings, and anxieties, and scruples of her bishops, and even bishops were obliged by her "to officiate at the table of the Lord; one as priest, another as deacon, and a third as sub-deacon, before the image of the

[1] See Zurich Letters, pp. 33, 40.
[2] Ibid. vol. ii, 16, 17.
[3] Ibid, p. 30.
[4] Ibid. vol. i, pp. 29, 33.

crucifix, or at least not far from it, with candles, and habited in the golden vestments of the Papacy."[5] The bishops felt, or affected to feel, scruples at the conduct of their sovereign; they wondered if they could lawfully conform to her wishes; and to solve their doubts, they deemed it requisite or prudent to ask the advice of the Reformers on the continent. Bullinger, and Bucer, and Martyr gave their oracular responses; but still, though the answers were far from satisfactory, the prelates did not think it expedient to avow their own convictions in such a way as to incur the displeasure of the queen. She was, if not head, at least governor of the English Church, and the English prelacy; and to the governor's wishes, the prelates quietly acceded *here*, whatever might be the extent of their opposition *there*. Had not the bench of bishops bided their time, they would in all probability have heard the Virgin Queen declare on oath,—Cox of Ely was thus frightened into order—*that she would unfrock them.*

How devoid of conscientious liberty the clergy were expected to be, can easily be gathered from a very important letter written to Bullinger by Withers and Barthelot. In answer to some statements sent to Switzerland, by the Bishops of London and Winchester, they observe: "On the 26th of March, 1566, all the London ministers were summoned before the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of London, the Dean of Westminster, and some canonists; and were there asked whether they were willing to acquiesce in the royal proceedings in matters of religion

[5] See Sampson's letter to Martyr, Jan. 6, 1560, ibid. p. 63, as also 66-7, 74, &c. The cross proved a cross indeed to the new clergy. They wished to remove it altogether, but could not. To effect their object, they strove to enlist the services of Bullinger, &c.

ordained and TO BE ORDAINED .... Those who refused compliance were deprived. The archbishop, too, when he grants anyone a licence to preach, binds him in these words: 'Provided always, that in your sermons, you shall not persuade the people to procure any alteration or innovation in religion, beyond or contrary to that *which the Queen's majesty has already effected, or shall effect.*'"[1] "There is power given by act of Parliament, to the queen and the archbishop, to introduce whatever ceremonies they please into every Church in the kingdom." Again we are told, "that if anyone should presume to interpret the Scriptures, without their (the bishops') permission, he is brought to trial as being guilty of contempt; and should he not then conform, they punish him by imprisonment or exile." Addressing again the Elector Palatine, Frederick III, whose interest he sought for the amelioration of the doctrine, the administration of the sacraments, and the discipline of the English Church, Withers at last thus prays: "We beg and entreat, ... that you will earnestly pray and obtain (and this we hope you will be able to accomplish) for those who abominate the relics of Antichrist, *the liberty of not being obliged, either to adopt them against their conscience, or to relinquish the ministry.*" Was there ever slavery like to this? to be bound to a few individuals whose fallibility was acknowledged, and whose authority to legislate in matters of religion, neither had been, nor could be established! This authority had been assumed, and like every other usurpation, was defended with a tyrant's sword. The Reformers were taught that to think for self was a duty; but thought was severely punished, unless it chanced to accord with the wishes of

[1] Zurich Letters, ii, 148, and pp. 150, 161-2. [2] Ibid. ii, 163.

the higher powers: they were bid to believe that they had shaken off a yoke, when they rejected the authority of the Pontiff; but they soon discovered that the yoke of the Pontiff had been removed for the far heavier one of a Queen, and that to each of them might be applied the poet's words

Incidit in Scyllam qui vult vitare Charybdim.

"We *endure*," says Pilkington, "I must confess, many things against our inclinations, *and groan under them, which, if we wished ever so much, no entreaty can remove. We are under authority, and cannot make any innovation without the sanction of the queen, or abrogate any thing without the authority of the laws;* and the only alternative now allowed us is, whether we will bear with these things, or disturb the peace of the Church."[3] Such is the confession of a Protestant bishop in the year 1573!!

The authority of the Articles then, is evidently nought: the whole system of the Reformation was clearly a human, a royal, a temporizing, and a self-seeking enactment. The very framers of the Establishment had no faith in it, as their conduct proved; they were willing to change and reform, reform and change again, according to the will of the sovereign. Elizabeth, and Parker and Jewel, the three who ruled the English Church, were no better than Henry, and Edward and Cranmer, their reforming predecessors. *These* were all changelings, and so were *they*. These were reckless of a nation's feelings, of the teachings of Christendom, and of the will of the Spiritual order, and Elizabeth and hers allowed only one authority to be obeyed, and one code of laws to be observed; that autho-

[3] Zurich Letters, i, 287-8.

rity was her own, and that code of laws was the system of which she herself approved. Where Elizabeth, or Edward, or Henry, or their followers, discovered that, though fallible they did not err, and that to them and to their parliaments it was given, even when in opposition to the teaching of the body of the clergy—as was the case 1° in the beginning of Henry's Reformation, and afterwards in the reign of Elizabeth,—to conclude aright in matters of religion, and be entitled to denounce and punish those as heretics who differed from their creeds, they have not been pleased to tell us. Assuredly, such a notion is in direct opposition to the teaching of the Church, and the express word of the New Testament, as we have already seen. And yet, to such lengths did men run in order to prop up the new system, as to pass the following enactment: "Nothing shall *henceforth* be accounted heresy, but what is so adjudged by the holy Scripture, *or* in one of the four first general councils, *or* in any other national or provincial council, determining according to the word of God, OR *finally, which shall be so adjudged in the time to come by the court of parliament, with the assent of the clergy in convocation.*" 1 Eliz. Acts of parliament alone can make Articles of faith, and acts of parliament alone can declare any doctrine heretical! Such is the great principle of Protestantism. This proves that the Church of England *is* certainly of this world. It is very different from the kingdom of Christ, which is *not* of this world. Light and darkness are not more opposed, than are the principles and establishment of the one Church of Christ, and those of the State Church of the Sixteenth Century, which came forth the "accuser" of a world, on its first appearance in 1534. How can the Catholic, or any one indeed who professes

Christianity to be a divine system, a system confirmed and ratified by such evidences as render the repudiation of it criminal, be expected to feel or to show, any reverence for Articles, or Homilies, or Prayer-book, emanating from such a source as has been already pointed out, as the fountain head of Protestantism? Protestantism in its origin and numerous developments is not only simply unproved, it is opposed to every thing sacred in religion, either as a dogma, a practice, or a proof.

Notwithstanding the 4th, 5th, and 36th Canons of the Synod of James I, in 1603, and the ordinances of Elizabeth already adduced, it seems to me, that even Anglicans have hardly dared to face the difficulty involved in the framing and subscribing of the Articles. They appear indeed, like the writers in the *British Critic*, more disposed to look upon them as "Articles of peace," than as "Articles of faith;" as statements rather intended to bind together the heterogeneous particles of Protestantism, than as dogmatical decisions intended to bind the conscience. "We do not look," says Bishop Bramhall, "upon the Articles of the Church of England, as essentials of saving faith, or legacies of Christ and his Apostles; but in a mean, as *pious opinions* fitted for the preservation of unity; neither do we oblige every man to *believe* them, *but only not to contradict them.*"[1] "The Church of England," says Stillingfleet, "excommunicates such as *openly oppose* her doctrine, supposing her fallible; the Roman Church excommunicates all, who will not *believe*, whatever she defines to be infallibly true."[2] Bishop Sanderson declares that the only thing he ever meant whilst subscribing the Articles was to declare that "the constant doctrine of the

[1] Schism Guarded, p. 190.

[2] Stilling. p. 104.

Church of England is so pure and orthodox, that whosoever believes it and lives according to it, shall be saved; and that there is *no error in it which may necessitate any man to disturb the peace or renounce the communion of it.*"[1] And Chillingworth's notions of subscription are contained in the following declaration: "I do verily believe the Church of England a true member of the Church (Catholic), that she wants nothing necessary to salvation, and holds nothing repugnant to it."[2]

Others have spoken even more clearly in relation to the character of the Articles. So far from looking on them as expressions of the divine mind, they have denounced them in the most unmeasured terms. "Understanding," says Jeremy Bentham, "that of such signature, the effect and sole object was the declaring after reflection, with solemnity, and upon record, that the propositions therein contained were in my opinion every one of them true; what seemed to me a matter of duty was, to examine them in that view, in order to see whether that were really the case. The examination was unfortunate. In some of them no meaning at all could I find; in others no meaning but one, which, in my eyes, was but too plainly irreconcilable either to reason or to Scripture. Communicating my distress to some of my fellow collegiates, I found them sharers in it."[3] Paley's ideas of the truthfulness of the Articles were equally low. "They who contend," he observes, "that nothing less can justify subscription to the thirty-nine Articles, than the actual belief of each and every proposition contained in them, must suppose that

[1] Bishop Sanderson, *apud* "*Free Disquisition*," p. 168.

[2] Maizeaux's Life of Chillingworth, p. 168.

[3] Life of Bentham, *apud Penny Encyc.*

the legislature expected the consent of ten thousand men, and that in perpetual succession, not to one controverted proposition, but to many hundreds. It is difficult to conceive how this could be expected by any who observed the incurable diversity of human opinions upon all subjects, short of demonstration."[4] Archdeacon Balguy says, "The Articles, we will say, are not exactly what we might wish them to be. Some of them are expressed in doubtful terms; others are inaccurate, perhaps unphilosophical; others again may chance to mislead an ignorant reader into some erroneous opinion; but is there any one among them that leads to immorality?"[5]

Bishop Watson even doubts the Church's *right* to frame articles of faith. "It is still a question," he says, "whether any Christian Church has a right to require from its public teachers, any other profession of faith than that of a belief in the Bible, as containing a revelation from God? It is still a question, whether, granting the abstract right, the *use* of it be expedient in any degree, and to what degree, in the present condition of the Church of England."[6]

Nay, more, it is openly and honestly avowed by Fellowes, that "since the time of Archbishop Laud, when an Armenian priesthood began to officiate in the Church, notwithstanding the Calvinistic complexion of the articles, the doctrine of original sin, *though supported in the ninth article, has never been either believed, or inculcated by, at least nine-tenths of the clergy of the Established Church.* The same (he adds) may be said of many other articles

[4] Moral, &c. Philosophy, p. 45. [5] P. 293.
[6] Tracts, vol. vi, 3rd page from end, 2nd Ed.

which have been either openly impugned or tacitly denied by many bishops and dignitaries of the Establishment, and by numbers of the inferior clergy, who have shed a lustre on the society to which they belonged, by their erudition and their virtues. Had the Church of England, adopting a less liberal and enlightened policy, hurled her anathemas and levelled her persecutions against all those who supported any tenet which was at all adverse to any one of those complex propositions, which are called *the* ARTICLES *of the Church*, our Taylors, our Barrows, our Tillotsons, our Clarks, our Jeffreys, our Hoadleys, our Jortins, and our Newcomes, and, in short, the whole galaxy of our best divines, must have sought a refuge among the members of a different communion. .... But *when the Church of England got rid of one Pope, it never intended to raise up thirty-nine in his place; but what would the thirty-nine Articles be, but thirty-nine Popes if, instead of the Scriptures being their expositors, they were made the infallible expositors of the Scriptures.*"[1] There is much truth in all this. Anglicans do teach diametrically opposite doctrines. The real presence, and an actual absence, of Christ in the Holy Eucharist; the power of absolution, and a scornful rejection of this power when exercised after confession; the collation of grace in baptism, and the empty character of this rite of Christ

[1] *Memoirs of the Life and Doctrines of Christ*, vol. i, pref. xix, and seqq. From the history of our own times, we know how truthful are the observations just made. High Church and low Church, Puseyite and Evangelicals, tear the Anglican Church to pieces. The high Church man proves *his* tenets by high Church evidence; and the Evangelical *his* by writings of the Clapham school. So apparent are these differences that the Government dares not allow the Convocation to act as a free and independent body. The permission would be suicidal.

tianity, are and have been respectively maintained by men who had sworn to receive the articles in their plain, grammatical sense. Whether or not it be true to say, that the thirty-nine Articles would in the case named, be equivalent to thirty-nine Popes, I leave others to determine: but this is at least true; when the Pope was rejected, the Sovereign and Parliament assumed an authority which the Catholic Church never did or could exercise. The former made their own will, law; and according to this will, the people were bid to change their religious creeds. Though fallible, they dictated as if infallible; and though themselves changeable, they demanded an extent of subserviency, which not even those *on the Rock* could have exacted. Instead of obeying an authority whose age was venerable, and whose title to rule was evidenced in the most solemn manner, Protestants found themselves *the slaves of the State,* even in matters of religion, though its authority to legislate in such matters had only been established by the despotism of force, and the threats of a cruel policy. *The insurgents against unity, demanded unity;* the destroyers of *all existing creeds,* raised up *a* creed; and the opposers of infallibility and inerrency, exacted under the most severe penalties, submission and assent to the teachings of a fallible and failing and changing system. The illustrious Count de Maistre has excellently described the state of Anglicanism, in his far-famed work entitled, "The Pope." "The Anglican Church is the only association in the world which has declared itself null and ridiculous, by the very act which constitutes it. In this act it has solemnly proclaimed thirty-nine Articles, neither more nor less, absolutely necessary to salvation,

and which must be sworn to in order to belong to this Church.[1] But one of the articles (the 25th) formally declares that God, in constituting his Church, has not left infallibility upon earth; that all the Churches, beginning with that of Rome, have fallen into error; that they have grossly erred, even as regards dogma, even as regards morality; so that none of them possess the right to lay down a creed; and that the Scriptures are the only rule of faith. The Anglican Church declares, therefore, to her children, that she is, indeed, entitled to command them, but that they are equally entitled to refuse her their obedience. At the same moment, with the same pen and ink, on the same paper, she enunciates dogmas, and declares she has no right to do so. I think I may be allowed to entertain the conviction, that of the interminable catalogue of human follies, this is one which will always hold a distinguished rank. After this solemn declaration of the Anglican Church, which nullifies itself, there was only wanting the testimony of the civil power to ratify this judgment; and this testimony I find in the Parliamentary debates of the year 1805, on the subject of Catholic Emancipation: "Call to mind, (said the Attorney-general,) that it is quite the same thing for England to repeal the laws enacted against the Catholics, or to have immediately a Catholic Parliament, and the Catholic religion, instead of *the existing Establishment.*" The commentary on this wonderfully ingenuous observation at once occurs. The Attorney-general might as well have said in as many words—"our religion, as you know, is nothing else than a purely civil establishment, having no

[1] This observation must be limited to the clergy. As is obvious, however, it does not affect the illustration or argument in hand.

other foundation than the law of the country, and the interest of each individual, &c." [2]

From what has been said, it appears that not only are the articles valueless as an authority, they are, moreover, directly opposed to the first principle of Protestantism: they in fact stultify the very idea of Reformation. They establish a creed; whereas the Reformation began in subverting all creeds, and moreover maintaining the incompetency not only of particular churches, but of the Church in the aggregate, to form a creed. They maintain the solibiblical system; whilst the subscription intended to ensure the submission of the clergy to the articles, and without which subscription the articles would have quickly become a dead and useless letter, tied the minister down to dogmas about which the Bible says not a syllable—to dogmas, in fact, in direct opposition to the Bible which had been made, in word at least, the rule of all truth. With one observation more, I will conclude this chapter, which has already been too much extended.

The English Articles, as we have seen, were drawn up

[2] Du Pape, Eng. Trans., p. 350-1. To those who have attended to the declarations recently made in Parliament (June 1854), during the discussion of the question connected with the admission of Dissenters into the University of Oxford, the previous extracts, drawn from the writings of some of the leading scholars of Anglicanism, will appear particularly striking. Every word which I have written has been more than confirmed. It has been publicly stated, that the Articles are full of contradictions; that they are not known, much less believed in, by too many of those who subscribe them; and further, that the late Bishop of Norwich, Stanley, declared, that he had never known a man who either did or could believe them. These parliamentary declarations are of great service: they expose more and more the hollowness of the Anglican system, and prove how little dependence is to be placed on the subscriptions *even of clergymen*, who serve the Establishment.

in 1562. In that year, or not very long after, they became the standard of orthodoxy. They were subscribed by the ministers of the Elizabethan establishment, who promised to regulate their instructions by the statements contained in the new code. The anomaly was indeed allowed to exist, of a clergy *preaching* one doctrine, and of a people *believing* another: still the articles were from the date named, the standard of ministerial orthodoxy—the standard, in a word, of the Church, as established and recognized by Parliament. These articles were a formal protest against Catholic unity. They emphatically denied what was elsewhere believed, and what had been believed uniformly in this land from the period of England's conversion in the second century, down to the apostacy in the sixteenth. They repudiated that which even the Centuriators of Magdeburg, and Gibbon, have allowed to have been maintained from the beginning. "A well-informed man, (says Gibbon,) cannot resist the weight of historical evidence, which establishes that, in the whole period of the four first ages of the Church, the principal points of the Papistical doctrines were already admitted in theory and in practice."[1] So obvious is this, that even Bishop Newton, whom none will suspect of saying one unnecessary word in favour of the antiquity of Catholicity, is forced to allow, that "the seeds of popery were sown even in the Apostles' times."[2] He might have gone further: he might have said, and said truly, that they were sown even in the times of and by Jesus Christ. Mosheim contents himself, as he records the doctrines of each century, with denouncing as superstitious whatever

[1] Gibbon, Memoir, vol. i, c. 1. [2] Dissert. on the Prophecies, vol. iii, p. 148.

may be opposed to his own views. Referring to the doctrines of the fifth age—an age which was illustrated by the virtues and learning of a Jerome, an Ambrose, an Augustine, a Chrysostom, an Optatus, a Prudentius, and a host of other champions of orthodoxy,—he says; "The happy souls of departed Christians were invoked by numbers, and their aid implored by assiduous and fervent prayers. .... The images of those who, during their lives, had acquired the reputation of uncommon sanctity, were now honored with a particular worship in several places. .... A singular and irresistible efficacy was also attributed to the bones of martyrs, and to the figure of the cross, in defeating the attempts of Satan. .... We shall not enter here into a particular account of the public supplications, the holy pilgrimages, the superstitious services paid to departed souls, the multiplication of temples, altars, &c. .... The famous Pagan doctrine, concerning the purification of departed souls, by means of a certain kind of *fire*, was more amply explained and confirmed now, than it had formerly been."[3] Nor is Neander less explicit than his predecessor Mosheim in reference to the early belief in, and practices of, Catholicity: "From the actions of daily life, (he observes,) in which this sign (of the cross) was everywhere customarily employed, and which were thus to be consecrated and sanctified, the sign probably passed over at an early period, to the places where the Christian communities assembled for worship. .... At Rome, the name of the Apostles, Peter and Paul, being often coupled together as martyrs, and the memory of both celebrated on the same day, it came about, that the figure of Christ attended by these two Apostles was

[3] Mosheim's History, vol. i, p. 382-3-4.

painted on the walls. .... Images of martyrs, venerated monks and bishops, were dispersed far and wide. The Antiochians had the likeness of their deceased Bishop Meletius engraved on their signets. .... In the course of the fourth age, men began, by degrees, to decorate the churches also with images. .... To exorcism was now added insufflation. .... The Bishop next touched the ear of the candidate, saying in the words of Mark, 'Ephphatha.'" He next refers to the baptismal renunciations, double unction, giving of salt, the *Missa catechumenorum*, and the *Missa fidelium*, and eventually he adds —"When the Bishop or Presbyter was about to finish the consecration, the curtain which hung before the altar was drawn up, and the consecrating minister now showed to the Church the outward elements of the Supper, which till now had been concealed from their eyes, *lifting them up as the body and blood of the Lord.*"[1] Such are the avowals of enemies—avowals clouded indeed by the darkness of misconception, such misconception as originates in the preconceived notions of revelation;—yet even these clearly demonstrate this great truth—that the Catholic Church of to-day is the Church of the fathers of primitive Christianity, even to the giving of a grain of salt, the using of the mystic unction, the breathing on the babe, and the uttering of a word—"*Be thou opened.*" These truths were denounced, these practices were condemned by the Anglican Church. Some were condemned as blasphemous, and others as idolatrous: and this condemnation men were ordered to believe, and to believe in numerous instances under the severest penalties. *Never had such a creed been heard of as was proposed in the sixteenth century. No Church*

[1] Neander, vol. iii, pp. 405-6-7 and 461-2-3-4, and alibi passim, Bohn's Ed.

in the world, no body of ministers testified to such a line of teaching; all was new, as a system. Particular doctrines had been maintained indeed by individuals, such as Aerius, Vigilantius, Pelagius, and others who had for ages been named in the annals of history only as heretics, as men cast out of the Church, as unfortunate persons who had been cut off like rotten branches from the vine, and whose end was destruction: but the English Articles, as *Church* Articles, were utterly in opposition, as far as they contained distinctive doctrines, to all existing creeds of any former age, and to the whole system of Church teaching which had been successively handed down as a revelation of the Almighty. Now this, in Protestant controversy, is always overlooked. Anglicans speak as if this code was wholly unassailable on the score of novelty. Nay more, they, the upholders of a new religion, new in *headship*, new in *sacraments*, new in *public worship*, new in *doctrine*, new in *practices*, new in its *liturgical language*, and new in *name*, dare to allude to the novelty of Pope Pius' profession of faith, forgetting that this new *profession* of faith—not creed—is not, even as a published document, more than one year posterior to the publication of the Anglican Articles! The Articles were *published* in 1563, and the profession of faith, known by the name of the Fourth Pius, appeared in 1564. If Pius' profession of faith be modern because published as late as 1564, are the Articles old because published as early as 1563?

Why do I allude to this? For a very plain reason: to show that Anglicanism stands self-convicted whilst rejecting the creed of Pius on the grounds it does. It cannot on the grounds adduced, justify its own Articles, or its

new creed. Further, I would wish the reader to consider the material difference between the two documents. The Protestant creed was formed in opposition to the belief of Christendom, whilst the Catholic profession of faith was nothing more than the expression of Christendom in favour of that religion which was spread then, and had been for centuries on centuries spread over the world, but which a few recent upstarts in Germany and England had denounced. Protestantism would pull down Catholicity, whilst Pius would defend the faith once delivered to the saints. All was novelty in the former creed, whilst, as Bramhall well observes, in one of his writings, which, I do not distinctly remember, Pius did nothing more than bind together the doctrines which Catholics universally professed. The Pontiff acted in accordance with the custom of the Church admitted from the beginning, and carried out a principle everywhere acknowledged as true. The Apostles or Apostolic men gradually formed the creed which bears their name. "There is," says Mosheim, "much more reason and judgment in the opinion of those who think that this creed was not all composed at once, but from small beginnings was imperceptibly augmented in proportion to the growth of heresy, and according to the exigences and circumstances of the Church, from whence it was designed to banish the errors that daily arose."[1] As heresies sprung up the Church opposed them; and according to the exigences of the times, added to the symbols such doctrines as heresiarchs had more formally attacked: thus teaching the faithful, distinctly

[1] Mosheim, vol. i, p. 94. See this opinion established in King's *History of the Apostles' Creed.* On the other hand see Selvagio, Antiq. Christ. vol. ii, p. 366, Vercellis, Anno 1778.

and formally, to avow whatever others openly denied. On this principle was formed, by the Fathers of Nice, in the year 325, the Nicene Creed: then the consubstantiality of the Son, which Arius and his followers had denied, was more distinctly published and declared than it had been in the Apostles' Creed; and in the year 381, to the words, "I believe in the Holy Ghost," were added these others: "The Lord and Giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father; who, together with the Father and the Son, is adored and glorified; who spake by the prophets."[2] Nor was this the last addition made to the Creed of Nice. In the Tenth Council of Lyons, the words "*filioque*" were added to the others, "who proceeds from the Father," to express what had been previously denied, and what is still denied by the Greek Church—the procession of the Holy Spirit from *the Son*, as well as from the Father. These additions were made on principle. The Church believed that she was the guardian of the faith; that she was appointed to hand down the truth to all times; and had the right, publicly to testify against all heresy, and to demand obedience to all her decisions. She spoke as one who had power; as one who was assisted by the Son who was *wisdom*, and the Holy Spirit who was *truth*. Such was her character in the first age, such too was it in the fourth century, such again in 1274, when the Tenth Council of Lyons was held, such likewise in 1564, when Pius promulgated the Profession of Faith, and such it will remain, even unto the consummation of the world: *Jesus Christ yesterday, to-day, and for ever*. Pius and the prelates of the Church, testified to the doctrines which they had received, and which they were commanded, like

[2] See the Constantinopolitan Creed.

those who had previously borne the burthen of the ministry, faithfully to deliver, as St. Basil expresses it, *from hand to hand*, to the rising generation. They claimed no power to feign Articles of Faith, to invent, to innovate, to oppose the dogmatical teaching of the Church which they now represented, but of which they were once only the little children, learning what the Church believed: all they claimed was to say what was the faith of the Church, and to define distinctly that faith. This they did; that they did no more, is established by the unchanged belief of Christendom, by the liturgies, the monuments, and the hundred other memorials of belief, which still endure, of the public faith of the sixteenth and previous centuries. Before the Profession of Faith of Pius appeared, the Mass was offered at every altar; Christ was adored in the holy sacrament; and transubstantiation was believed in as an ineffable mystery; saints were invoked, and their memorials were venerated; purgatory was a state of temporary suffering on account of sin, in which the souls of the dead were helped by the sacrifice and holy prayer; and the faithful, by good works performed for this holy end, laboured to obtain the indulgences of the Church. Not even were the additions to the creed of Pius *fresh terms of communion:* all Catholics as such were previously bound to believe them. That they were believed, even the Articles of Protestantism, as well as the laws of Edward and Elizabeth, as clearly establish as the document which emanated from the Holy See. Assuredly the Fathers of Nice and Lyons had not as much extrinsic evidence for their *additions* to the Creed of the Apostles, as Catholics in the sixteenth century had, for those appended to the previously existing creeds. As Hawarden

well observes, in reference to the wide distinction between fresh articles of faith and fresh terms of communion: "Articles of Christian faith are the work of God only. He made them all, by revealing them to the Apostles, who were commissioned to make them *known* to the Catholic Church; as *she* is commissioned, when the primitive and Apostolic faith is called in question, to make it *known* to her children. For to make articles of faith, and to make them *known* are quite different things. *God* made them articles of faith; but the Catholic Church and the Apostles made them *known*, as orthodox and authentic publishers of the divine revelation. English laws are not *made*, but by King and Parliament: but those who print them by authority, make them known to the public."[1]

Whilst all is consistency in Catholicity, and conformity to ancient usage and more ancient principles, what is the position which Protestantism takes, whilst framing articles of belief and teaching dogmatically? Why, the reverse of consistency. Though fallible, as I have more than once noticed, the Anglican Church practically claims to be looked upon as infallible; though opposing the Church from which it separated, it disallows all opposition to its own ordinances; though actually anathematizing a belief which has been hallowed by the faith and virtues of ages, it exacts assent to one, novel and unknown, or if known, only known to be denounced by the professors of an olden

[1] Charity and Truth, p. 178-9. This work is really valuable, as are indeed all the works of this great scholar and clear-minded writer. I recommend it highly to those who cannot understand the doctrine of *exclusive salvation*, or the difference between new articles of faith and new terms of communion.

creed, and by the innovators in other lands. Its decrees and ordinances are framed, not in consequence of a belief constantly handed down, but they are made to suit the feelings of the moment, the gratification of individuals, or the chances of aggrandizement, resultant from the formation of articles of belief denunciatory of dogmas and customs, the profession of which, had eventuated in loading the altars of religion with gold, and silver, and precious things. Tradition and authority—such authority, I mean, as could consistently exercise any kind of control—were repudiated and ignored; and man became, uncommissioned, unsent, uninspired, a god to his fellow man.

Chapter the Fourth.

On the Origin and Authority of the Homilies.

CONTENTS.

Origin and end of the Homilies.—Read in all Churches, by order.—Their authors.—Character of these authors.—Specimens of their gross inconsistencies and contradictions.—The Homilies approved of by the Articles, but disliked by the people.—Signs of dislike.—Condemned as false and contradictory.—The justice of this condemnation.—They are worthless in themselves and in their origin.

To the ignorance of the clergy, and the determination on the part of the Reformers, to propagate Protestantism, we owe the two sets of Homilies. I have had occasion already to notice the sadly degraded state of the new clergy, and the treatment which they had to endure from their superiors. Never were children more unceremoniously commanded. The new clergy were forced to do the bidding of the few in power, though by doing so they published their own shame, and the contempt in which they were held by those who knew them best. They had the despicable task assigned them, of accounting for *one chapter of the Old or New Testament in the week;* and since even this was found to be too difficult, in 1586 a less "*laborious lesson*" was prescribed.[1] To express their

[1] Cardwell's Coll. Doc. CI.

own thoughts was interdicted at a very early period. They were condemned to read what others had written, to their respective congregations; they were made mere automata —puppets, whose gyrations were directed by Cranmer, and Latimer, and Becon, and Jewel, and such like adventurers.[1]

The Homilies of the Church of England consist of two parts. The first containing twelve discourses, was published in the year 1547, during the reign of Edward the Sixth; whilst the latter, consisting of twenty-one sermons, was published in the reign of Elizabeth, in the year 1560. Both books, as we have seen, were approved of in the thirty-fifth Article, as containing *a godly and wholesome doctrine.* Of their authors little is positively known, and Fuller assures us, that objections were raised against them from this circumstance. "However some," he says, "behold these Homilies as not sufficiently legitimated by this Article, to be (for their doctrine) the undoubted issue of the Church of England, alleging them composed by private men of unknown parts, who may probably be presumed at the best, but the chaplains of the Archbishops under whom they were made."[2] To Cranmer, however, the first series is generally, if not uniformly ascribed. It is however plain, that he did not compose all the sermons of the series; for Becon was undoubtedly the writer of the *Homily against whoredom and uncleanness.*[3] The origin of the *second* book of Homilies is still more problematical: but the public voice has assigned it to Jewel. It may be his; still I think that this is not sufficiently established.

[1] See Burnet on the thirty-fifth Article; as also Prettyman, pp. 535—8.

[2] See Fuller's Church History, Book ix, p. 75, &c.

[3] See Becon's Works, p. 643. Parker Soc. Ed.

Of the first of these three individuals we have said enough. He was either uncertain about religion to the end, or his life was one continuous act of hypocrisy and deceit. Such a man's opinions of religion are undeserving of the attention of any one who looks for *faith*, and not for the aberrations of a mind *seeking but never finding truth*. Becon may fairly be styled the Prince of Scurrility. Open his works where you will—these works are very numerous, forming three large and closely printed volumes—you will be sure to find language which reason shrinks from and Christianity reprobates. This man from a Catholic became a Protestant, under some of the phases of Protestantism, in the time of Henry VIII. But this Protestantism did not please the Pope-king; and accordingly Becon was called to account for his opinions. Unwilling to receive so soon the crown of martyrdom, he prudently recanted his errors at Paul's Cross in 1542, in the following words: "Worshipful audience, for declaration of my sorrowful heart, and the testifying unto you of my unfeigned conversion from error to truth, I occupy this day the place of a penitent, praying you to give credit to that, which I shall now say of myself."[4] Soon afterwards he abandoned his faith, and retracted like the Archbishop whose chaplain he was, his retractation. How often he changed, or what was his belief during the reigns of Edward, Mary, and Elizabeth, it would be difficult to determine. Suffice it to say, that his writings, like those of Cranmer, are exceedingly discrepant; and in consequence of this discrepancy, the recent editor of his works has found himself necessitated to write the following apology, if apology it can be called, for the variations of his author's doctrinal develop-

[4] See Pref. to Becon's Works, p. viii.

ments: "It must be remembered that his early writings were composed in the earlier stages of the Reformation, when some doctrines and many ceremonies of the Romish Church, afterwards rejected, were still retained. Becon naturally wrote for the times; he described the rites which were performed before his eyes; he was willing to approve as far as he conscientiously could, the institutions then in force. Besides, his own views did not and could not at once arrive at the clearness and decision by which they were afterwards distinguished. Indeed, *this may be said of all the contemporary divines, who renounced popery step by step, as they became convinced of the erroneous character of its tenets.* But in consequence, when several years afterwards, Becon came to revise his works, he found that his doctrinal sentiments were modified, and that several of the rites he had explained were used no longer. He did not however deem it necessary, altogether to remodel his treatises: he contented himself with a mere change of the expressions, such as 'of the Sacrament of the Altar,' into 'the Sacrament of Christ's body and blood;' and referring to the ceremonies, as those which *were* used. It is very desirable that the reader of these early treatises, should not forget that they were written before the full development of the Reformation in England."[1] How pitiful all this is! But, as St. Augustin has well observed "*in malâ causâ non possunt aliter. At malam causam quis coegit eos habere?* Still, such observations have their use. They further evidence the rationalistic character of the Reformation, which was a purely deductive, inferential

[1] See Pref. p. xviii. The Works themselves are a proof that Becon's changes were more than *modifications*. He denounced in the most *unchristian* language whatever ran counter to his temporary convictions.

system: and a system dependant on a thousand casualties for success. It was man's work, and man's only; and hence like all the other works of man, it proceeded, as the editor just referred to graphically describes it, *step by step*. The omnipotent *fiat* was wanting; the influx of the heavenly grace, by virtue of which a man could exclaim "*Credo*," was likewise wanting; and man found himself altering and altering, changing and changing, till the very name of religion became a mockery, and England a Babel, where no man understood his neighbour. Had life been lengthened out in the Sixteenth century as much as it was in the days of those who worked at the lofty tower, heaven only can tell, whither men with changed leaders, and parliaments and influences might have gone, *step by step*. Assuredly their notions would have differed materially at the age of 600, from those which they had entertained at 60: individuality would have been entirely forfeited.

Jewel's character is like that of the two preceding Protestant worthies. A Catholic at first, and afterwards a violent Protestant in the reign of Edward, he hesitated not to subscribe "some of the Popish doctrines" in the early part of Mary's reign. Afterwards, he joined the ranks of Elizabeth, and fought her battles till death seized him in the year 1571. He was closely connected with the foreign Protestants, as is clear from the *Zurich Letters*; and it was at Frankfort that he made in 1554, a public confession of his sorrow for his previous subscription to the tenets of Popery.[2] As a controvertist he has been

[2] See these facts recorded in Jewel's Life. Biog. Dict., vol. vii, p. 388, ed. 1784, as also Penny Encyc. vol. xiii, p. 117. "Jewel," it is said,

much praised by his party. So excellent indeed were his works adjudged to be in the days of Elizabeth, that they were found worthy to be chained up in the public church, and associated with those of the *mendacious* Fox, as the martyrologist has been justly called. To me, however, his writings appear unworthy of any great leader of a party. Learning, honesty, and consecutiveness should characterize the productions of such a man: learning by which each point shall be clearly illustrated and proved; honesty which shall serve to convince the reader that truth and not system, religion and not interest, are the ends in view; and consecutiveness by which the discourse may be made a whole; sentence following sentence, idea idea, in such a manner as to render the whole work in its plan and development apparent and clear. Such is not the description which the impartial reader will give of Jewel's writings; for neither learning, nor honesty, nor clearness can fairly be ascribed to them. Passages from St. Augustin[1] and St. Jerome,[2] relative to the sufficiency of the sacred Scriptures, are shamefully corrupted and misrepresented; words are omitted in a citation from the Third Council of Carthage, in regard of the books read in the Church, on which the entire meaning depends; and the disgraceful language of Zwinkfeld relative to the Holy Scriptures, which Hosius denounces in his work on *the Word of God*, is ascribed to the illustrious Cardinal! An objection urged by *de Magistris* relative to the criminality of fornication, is held up as the doctrine of that Divine; and he is made to assert that fornication is not a crime, though the whole

"it seems, for a short time, somewhat temporized." These expressions are wonderfully considerate.

[1] De Unit. Eccæ. c. iii. [2] S. Jerome in c. i, Aggæi.

hapter was written to prove that it was one of a most leadly character. S. Leo is stated to have inhibited the celebration of two masses on the same day in the same church, he text saying quite the reverse; and St. Clement to have leclared that a Pope could not carry the "*two swords*," vhereas the saint speaks only about *worldly cares*.[3] In his pages too we find every fable faithfully recorded which malice or ignorance had invented against the Roman Pontiffs. Pope Joan appears before the reader as a wonderful reality; on Frederick's neck, the Pontiff is seen to tread; nd by his orders Dandalus, the doge of Venice, is tossed ike a chained dog beneath the pontifical table, there to naw the bones with which he might chance to be supplied. n a word, the figments of Bale and Barnes are adopted vithout examination by this unprincipled and overrated vriter and bishop of Salisbury. If Swift's word can be elied on, Burnet had a *worthy* predecessor in the person f Jewel.

Reckless in his statements, he fearlessly declared that o be a fact, of which he actually knew nothing. In his Apology,"[4] he states absolutely that the Greeks "have either private masses, nor mangled sacraments, nor purgatories, nor pardons." This statement drew down upon im a severe answer from Harding in 1565. Accordingly ve find him in the following year, thus writing from Salisbury, on the 10th of March, to his great authority, Bullinger: "I wish to know whether those Christians who

[3] The reader acquainted with the Apology of Jewel will at once know where the passages are to which I have alluded. I have not cited the words of Jewel, or of the Fathers, for fear of crowding my pages too much. *Harding's Reply to the Apology* is deserving of the reader's attention.

[4] See 14 Chap. of Apology.

are at the present time scattered throughout Greece, Asia, Syria, Armenia, &c., use *private* masses, and what kind of masses, private or public, are now in use among the Greeks at Venice."[1] Again, in proof of Jewel's being a hasty copier, and not a scholar, I will instance his reference to Camocensis, who was made to state that "it was quite a usual thing with the Popes to wrest the Scriptures," in his "Apology,"[2] as also in his reply to Dr. Cole. Thus the word stood in four editions of Jewel's works. Now what did Jewel know of this author? Nothing. In the letter to Bullinger just cited I find this other query. "Again *a certain Camocensis*, is sometimes quoted, as having written with asperity against the lives and insolence of the Popes Who was this Camocensis, of what order, and in what time and country did he live?"[3] Thus he knew neither who his authority was, nor what was his profession, his country, or even the age in which he lived! And yet, the unknown author was confidently appealed to, because he was supposed to be opposed to the Popes! Indeed, Jewel as an authority is worthless; and further, the antecedents of his life render all he says suspicious at the very least.

What opinion the people had of the Homilies which were thrust upon them, may easily be gathered from Latimer's account of their reception. "Some," he says, "call them Homelies, and indeed so they may be well called, for they are homely handled. For though the priest read them never so well, yet if the parish like them not, *there is such talking and babbling in the church that*

[1] This query contains nearly all Harding's Reply. He observed that in all the East, there were private Masses. Hence the lengthened enquiry. See Zurich Letters, vol. i, 156.

[2] Harding, 286.

[3] Zurich Letters, vol. i, 156.

othing can be heard ; and if the parish be good and the riest naught, he will so hack it and chop it, that it were s good for them to be without it, for any word that shall e understood. And yet (the more pity) this is suffered f your Grace's Bishops, in their dioceses, unpunished."[4] Gardiner and others immediately protested against the ew sermons ; proved them to be in direct opposition in ne instance at least, in respect to the Solifidian system, to ne sacred Scriptures ; and further showed how in num-ers of places they contradicted the Commentary of Erasmus, which, by being placed in the Churches and ecommended by the State, was looked upon as sacred, as acred as the Homilies with which the writings of Erasmus ere connected. With time the dislike increased ; and om some cause or other, these Homilies which by Eliza-eth's order were at first read by all Parsons, Vicars, urates, and all others having Spiritual cure, on all Sun-ays and Holidays, in all Churches and Chapels, are now early unread and unknown.

> Quis legit hæc ?—Nemo hercule. Nemo ?
> Vel duo vel Nemo. Turpe et miserabile !

Montague and Burnet, and Overall, not to refer to her authors, do not seem to have entertained any very gh opinion of these discourses. "They seem," says the rst named writer, "to speak somewhat too hardly, and retch some sayings beyond the use and practice of the hurch of England, as also their dehortations—(as the ncient Fathers often did) — somewhat hard upon the

[4] Latimer's Second Sermon before King Edward, vol. i, p. 121.

tenters."[1] Burnet allows that "they need a little correction or explanation," and further says "that the Scriptures are often applied in them, as they were then understood; not so critically as they have been explained since that time:"[2] whilst Overall praises the Church for having "wisely reserved to itself the authority of correcting them and of setting forth others."[3]

But are these Homilies in accordance with the teachings of Anglicanism: do they agree even with the Sixth Article, though they are praised in a subsequent one, the Thirty-fifth? Among the Apocryphal works of the sacred Scriptures, are reckoned the Books of Wisdom, Baruch, Tobias, &c.: and these are declared positively not to be Scripture in the Sixth Article, which the Anglican ministers subscribe. What if in the Homilies these books are distinctly named, or virtually acknowledged to be, sacred and inspired writings? Now this is the case. Tobias, in the Second Homily *on Alms deeds*, is distinctly stated to be inspired by the Holy Spirit, and to be a portion of the Holy Scriptures. "The same lessons doth the Holy Ghost also teach us in sundry places of the Scripture," after which words Tob. iv is immediately specified. Baruch is twice called a Prophet, and his book cited as a portion of the *Scriptures*, in the *first Homily against rebellion*. Again, the book of Wisdom which is referred to eleven times in the *Homilies for Rogation week*, is cited as a work of SOLOMON.

Nor is this all. In the *third Homily on Charity*, Henry

[1] Appeal, c. xxiii. [2] Exposition of xxxv Article.

[3] See Nichol's Appendix. Add to these the Seven Strictures of Milton, "*Animadversions on the Remonstrant's defence.*"

VIII, of whom Heylin truly says, "*he never spared woman in his lust, nor man in his anger,*"[4] and whose character has been so ably delineated by Mackintosh, as the impersonation of evil,[5] is compared to the noble and pious princes, whose names are recorded in the sacred pages with praise. "God did put light in the heart of his faithful and true minister, of most famous memory, King Henry VIII, and gave him the knowledge of his word, and an earnest affection to see his glory, &c., as he gave the like spirit unto the most noble and famous, Josaphat, Josias, and Ezechias." Can this be the character of him, whose name is allowed, at all hands, to be a blot on the page of history? Others have thought that the light which dazzled the monarch, emanated, not from heaven, but "from Anne Boleyn's eyes,"[6] and this conjecture is borne out by the whole tenor of Henry's life: the ray of light was earthly, it was meteoric; it was not heavenly. And indeed, if Henry *received from God the knowledge of his word,* then is the Anglican Church of the Homilies, whether it be the Church of Edward, or his sister Elizabeth, self-condemned. For did not Edward, as well as Elizabeth, repudiate the religion of their father, and each raise up a system of belief, wholly different from that which their parent had schemed? If Henry was inspired by God, then is Anglicanism, which disallows the real presence, renounces the Mass as a blasphemous fable, repudiates Penance as a sacrament, a heresy; for Henry believed in Christ in the Holy Mystery, and in the Mass, as a holy and propitiatory sacrifice, and in Penance as a sacrament by which sins were blotted out. If the Homilies contain

[4] Heylin, Hist of Reform. p. 15. [5] English Hist. vol. ii.
[6] Ibid. p. 151.

a true and godly doctrine on this point, Anglicanism should cease; if the doctrine they contain is false, then should the believers in the Thirty-nine Articles, *the forty stripes less one*, repudiate them:

Utrum horum mavis accipe.

In either case the present Church of England is proved to be a nullity.

Nor do the discrepancies between the Homilies and belief of Protestantism end here. I will content myself with giving another instance of these differences, in respect to a matter of great importance. Whilst some Anglicans are holding meetings against certain practices sanctioned by the Bishop of Exeter, relative to confession and absolution, and agitating the country about this important matter, the *Homily of Common Prayer and Sacraments* maintains, *that "absolution,"* which must, as is well known and felt, be preceded by confession, *"hath the promise of the forgiveness of sins."* Again, the Homilies are at variance with one another. In the Homily just referred to, it is said, "As for the number of sacraments instituted by Christ, and expressly commanded in the New Testament, there be but two, namely, Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord"; but the Homily *against swearing* distinctly speaks of *"the sacrament of Matrimony,"* immediately after *the sacrament of Baptism.* If men, knowing the character of these discourses, hesitate about subscribing them, except in a qualified sense, no conscientious person will be surprised.[1]

The conclusions to be drawn from these remarks are

[1] See Bennett and Burnet on the thirty-fifth Article, especially the former, who enters at length into this matter.

obvious. First, if the character of the compilers be considered, the Homilies are certainly of no authority; and secondly, if intrinsic evidence is to have any weight with the reader, in this point of view the Homilies are to be rejected as false and as contradictory; contradictory of one another, and contradictory of the Articles by which they are sanctioned.

Chapter the Fifth.

On the Anglican Liturgies.

CONTENTS.

History of the Liturgical changes.—Forms of prayer condemned, though previously ascribed to the Holy Ghost.—History of the Primer, &c. in Henry's time.—Edward's Liturgies.—Changes in them.—Authors of the changes.—Elizabeth's Liturgy.—Changes, and grounds of the alterations.—The Liturgy disapproved of formerly and now.—The objections raised against it.—Alterations suggested.—The changes in the Liturgy as well as in the Articles, prove the hollowness and worldliness of Anglicanism.—Observations on the words "*our Liturgy.*"—Whence did the Anglicans derive those prayers, of which they boast so much?

By a natural transition, we proceed to the examination of the Liturgy of the new creed. Lex *orandi* est lex *credendi*. According to this rule, we may easily infer, that a material alteration of prayer, involves a material alteration in belief, and that an uncertainty in the matter of prayer betrays an uncertainty of system. Now the Liturgy of the new Church, or its form of prayer, has changed, and materially. This has been cursorily shown already: it is now our duty to dwell upon this point at some length. Prior to the Reformation, the Mass was considered to be the great, the all-important liturgical act. Each day it

as offered up before crowds of worshippers; but on the undays, the entire population deemed itself bound to ssist at the solemn rite. And the language used during ıe Holy Sacrifice was not the vernacular of England: ıe sweet Latin language was the language of the Mass. his service Henry retained. He did more: he hoped see all his followers retain it; and so little did he anti- pate the cessation of this rite, that, as Burnet says, he left by his will, to the Church at Windsor, £ 600 a year r ever, for two priests to say Mass at his tomb daily." [1] till, he commenced the work of innovation in the prayers the Church, and those who came after him prosecuted to the extent of excluding even the Mass from the iturgy. He caused the *Primer* to be published in the ernacular tongue in 1535, and ten years afterwards a cond Primer appeared by his authority. Edward im- roved on his father's example. Guided by the meteoric ghts of Cranmer and Somerset, he wandered further om orthodoxy than Henry had done; and in 1549, was ublished a Liturgy in the English language, differing idely from that which had been used for nearly a thou- nd years in this kingdom. It need not be said that ranmer, who was aided by Ridley and eleven other ishops and divines, was the framer of this Liturgy. This iturgy which was approved of by the Parliament in 1548, as declared to have been drawn up by the special assistance the Holy Spirit, and as such was thrust upon the accept- ıce of the nation in the following year. Still, as I have ready noted, though much was changed, much too was tained which was Catholic. *The Supper of the Lord,* ommonly called *the Mass,* was offered up at the altar;

[1] Vol. ii, p. 13, Ed. 1683.

the round unleavened bread was, as formerly, made use of; water too was mixed with the wine; the *nearly usual* order of the service was retained; the dead were prayed for in these Catholic words: "We commend unto thy mercy, O Lord, all other thy servants, which are departed hence from us, with the sign of faith, and now do rest in the sleep of peace: grant unto them, we beseech thee, thy mercy, and everlasting peace...."; the elements on the altar of bread and wine were bl✠essed and sanc✠tified, "that they may be unto us the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ"; and people were told to believe, that though the bread of consecration was divided, they did not therefore receive less than if they had received the whole: "*And men must not think less to be received in part, than in the whole; but in each of them the* WHOLE BODY *of our Saviour Jesus Christ.*"[1] The doctrine of the real presence, with its consequences, was expressed in the most distinct language. After the consecration, the minister humbly besought God, "that whosoever should be partakers of *this holy communion, may worthily receive the most precious body and blood of thy Son Jesus Christ,* and be fulfilled with thy grace and heavenly benediction, and made one body with thy Son Jesus Christ, that he may dwell in them and they in him."[2] When the sacrament was administered under the form of bread, these words were used by the minister: "The body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life." This was called the delivery of "the Sacrament of the body of Christ"; and when "the Sacrament of the blood" was administered, the language was

[1] Liturgy of Edward VI, p. 8, 97, Parker Ed. [2] Ibid. 89, 92.

qually orthodox and emphatic: "The blood of our Lord esus Christ, which was shed for thee, preserve thy body nd soul unto everlasting life." In Baptism, the exorsms were pronounced, the cross was made, and the child as anointed with chrism, and clothed with the white arment. The sick, too, if they wished it, were anointed; nd when the soul had left the body, the minister who fficiated at the burial prayed thus: "Grant, unto this thy ervant, that the sins which he committed in this world be ot imputed unto him, but that he, escaping the gates of ell, and pains of eternal darkness, may ever dwell in the egion of light with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in the lace where is no weeping, sorrow, nor heaviness," &c.[3] ut in a short while, all this was changed. The "*heaven uided*" compilers of the work, were condemned to see, erhaps themselves to undertake, a change in the Prayerook. In 1552 another edition was published. Prayers r the dead, the baptismal unction, the collation of the hite garment, as well as the exorcisms, were quietly ppressed; and instead of a clear declaration of belief the Holy Mystery, a contrary dogma was enunciated: *the creatures of bread and wine*" were received in reembrance of Christ's passion and death; and when *the read* was delivered, oh how changed was the expression! was now, "Take and eat this, in remembrance that hrist died for thee, and feed on him in thy heart by ith, with thanksgiving."[4] Instead of Christ, bread was iven! The reality had disappeared, and men were bid feast on *an idea:* who shall wonder if such *eaters* ungered and perished! It was likewise stated in the

[3] Ibid. 147. [4] Ibid. 279.

rubric, that "the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ's natural body to be at one time in more places than one,"[1] and what was here said, was appended to the *Article on the Lord's Supper*.[2] But when Mary came to the throne, the acts of 1549 and of 1551 were repealed by the authority of the crown and Parliament. It was then admitted that the faith of former times was the true Catholic faith; and, on bended knees, the framers of these varying laws asked for and obtained absolution from a Roman cardinal, for their former aberrations from orthodoxy. It had been well if the changing tide had here stopped; but it was not to be so. The Papally-denounced daughter of Boleyn, Elizabeth, claimed the right of establishing that form of faith and Liturgy, which was most agreeable to her ideas of religion, or fondness of innovation, when she came into possession of the crown of England. The act of repeal was reversed, in opposition to the wishes of the English prelates, all of whom, but one, and he was looked upon as "the calamity of his see," clung to the creed of Rome, and opposed strenuously all alterations in religion. This opposition it was requisite to stop; and since neither entreaties nor menaces availed, to alter the determination of the bishops, they were deprived, tossed into prison, and condemned to weep over the boldness of a woman and a parliament of laymen, who dared, in opposition to every known canon of the Church, to supply their places by unauthorized, perhaps unordained ministers, and to exchange the ancient Liturgy for another modification of the *second* Prayer-book of

[1] Liturgy of Edward VI, p. 283. [2] Ibid. 534.

Edward VI. Still Elizabeth, who seems to have been, as Heylin[3] observes, a zealous advocate of the real presence, refused to admit the last declaration of Edward, relative to the Holy Mystery, either into the Liturgy or the Articles; and further, she deemed it advisable to restore the rejected words, "the body of our Lord, &c. preserve thy body and soul," which restoration remained in force till 1661. In this year, Charles II issued a commission to empower twelve bishops, and as many Presbyterian divines, to consider the objections raised against the Liturgy, which were both many and urgent, and sanctioned by the learning and authority of Dr. Reynolds, Bishop of Norwich, Drs. Tuckney, Connant, Wallis, and Manton, besides Jackson, Case, Baxter[4] and others. The result was, that though the declaration was not restored, the words in Elizabeth's Liturgy, "It is here declared, that no adoration is intended, or ought to be done, unto any real and essential presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood" were cancelled, and in their place the following were substituted: 'It is here declared, that no adoration is intended, or ought to be done, unto any corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood." Several lessons and prayers appointed to be read, were suppressed, and others were substituted which were deemed more suitable; some of the collects, too, were changed; the Epistles and Gospels were ordered to be read from the text of James's Bible; and the office of Baptism for those of riper years was likewise engrafted into the Prayer-book: the Liturgy was, in a

[3] Hist. of Queen Elizabeth, p. 124.

[4] It may seem strange, but it is a fact, that to Baxter, though not a Protestant, the bishopric of Hereford was offered. The offer was constently refused.—*Carwithen's Hist. of Eng.* p. 402.

word, brought to that state in which it now stands. The recent alterations were subscribed, as several other alterations had been subscribed by both houses of Convocation, on the 20th of December, 1661; and eventually they received the approbation of both houses of Parliament, which passed an act for the establishment of this corrected and amended edition of the Anglican Liturgy.[1]

Such are the principal changes to which the Prayer-book of the English Church has been subjected, during the brief period of its uncertain existence. Some of the changes are radical, affecting doctrines of vital importance: changes which clearly establish the falsehood of either the actual or the former Anglican creed. Such changes offer further evidence of the human origin of the Establishment; they prove it to be a work of mere man, and not of man divinely assisted or guided; they further shake for ever all *faith* in the system itself, as well as in the framers of the system. But, on this head, further remark will be useless: we have, already more than once, drawn the reader's attention to these obvious inferences.

It must not, however, be imagined, that though the Liturgy of 1661 was established both by Convocation and by Parliament, therefore men's minds have been satisfied. Complaints have from time to time rung through the nation relative to the state of the Liturgy. It has been said, and perhaps never more clearly than in these our days, that a change was absolutely required. Fault has been found by some with the Athanasian Creed; by others, with the form of absolution; whilst a third party

[1] See Shepherd's critical and practical Illustration of the Morning and Evening Prayer of the Church of England; as also Wheatly's Illustration of the Book of Common Prayer; and Pretyman's Elements, vol. ii, pp. 27-8.

has pointed with scorn to the emphatic words adopted in the ordination service—"receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands: *whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained*"[2]—as contrasted with the avowed faith of Anglicanism, and with its use of this apparently collated power.[3] As an instance of the lengths to which this feeling has been allowed to run, I will lay before the reader a few words of a petition addressed to the House of Lords, to which it was presented on the fifth of August, 1833, by the Rev. C. N. Wodehouse, prebendary of Norwich. The petition states —"that your petitioner, on reviewing in after years the engagements which he had thus entered into, became doubtful whether he could renew them if called upon to do so; that further reflection only serving to add strength to such scruples, he feels himself bound no longer to conceal his opinions; and that he now ventures to lay them before your lordships, in the hope of being relieved from the difficulty in which he is involved. That your petitioner begs accordingly to state, that when called upon to declare the Liturgy and Articles of the Church of England to be in every respect 'agreeable to the word of God,' he thinks himself obliged to make such a declaration according to the plain, obvious meaning of the words then used by him; and that your petitioner cannot con-

[2] *The Ordering of Priests, in the Liturgy.*

[3] Whilst writing this, I have fresh evidence of the denial of the power of absolution. McNeile and his, have been recently gathering together to denounce a power, which, if words can convey a meaning, they ought to have received, and to believe in.

scientiously affirm the following parts of the Liturgy to be sanctioned by Scripture, namely, the 2nd, 28th, 29th, and 42nd clauses of the Athanasian Creed; the form of absolution in the office for visiting the sick; and the words used at the imposition of hands in ordaining priests and bishops."[1] Notwithstanding the proposal to effect alterations on these and other points, no opposition was raised to the petition by either the Archbishop of Canterbury, or the Bishops of London, Chichester, and Hereford, who were present on the occasion in the upper house. By numbers, and among these were men of the greatest eminence, the objections were felt and admitted; it was distinctly allowed indeed that alteration was required. But what induced them still to exclaim, *'desine quieta movere?* Why this: they feared lest the fabric might be pulled down, if touched. It seemed to them, as hazardous a thing to allow Wodehouse to play with alterations, as to permit Sampson to play before the Philistines. He played with pillars, and pulled a palace down; and would less fatal results follow from a profane removal of the pillars of the moral fabric? "Who is there (it was asked) who would wantonly break that mere spell of opinion, which now consecrates the Liturgy as an almost faultless composition, to so many hearts and minds which refuse to perceive its little blemishes?" The spell of opinion was a delusion—that was known and felt—but was it to be broken! Whilst the people were taught to believe that the ritual was all perfect, one of the ministers of Anglicanism[2] was denouncing it "as spotted and wrinkled,

[1] See Petition to the House of Lords, by Wodehouse, p. 10.

[2] Riland's British Liturgy, p. 17.

with such sarcasm, resentment, abuse, and assumption of its own excellence, as grieves and irritates its best friends; while it furnishes gratuitous matter of contempt and recrimination to those whom—and here duty and self-interest are closely combined—it ought to have pitied and disarmed." The "*apocryphal* defilements" of the Prayer-book, with its confused and fictitious version of the Psalms; the expressions in the marriage service which were looked upon as *quaint and unintelligible to the lower orders, and which convey hardly any meaning according to modern ideas and habits*"; "*the sure and certain hope*" of the burial service; the courtly and complimentary terms addressed or applied to the sovereign; the state services, which seemed rather fitted to promote rancour and hatred, than "peace and good will;" in fine, the Athanasian Creed, as well as the ordination services, and the visitation of the sick, presented difficulties to thousands of well-minded and piously disposed individuals; difficulties which they were anxious to surmount by erasure, and substitution of something more consonant to their ideas of right and orthodoxy. So opposed was Archbishop Sancroft, prior to his elevation to the highest Ecclesiastical dignity in the Anglican Establishment, to the Burial Service, that, as he owned to Archbishop Tillotson, "for that very reason he had never had a cure of souls." Mr. Veneer declares, that "it is plain that the office for the dead, was never intended to be used at the burial of men notorious for their vices, of such as die in a state of notorious impenitence, without any appearance of their return to God," and hence he advises the omission of certain phrases in the prescribed service. In the *Commination Service* read at the beginning of Lent—that period of the

year which is to be hallowed by abstinence and fasts, according both to the rubric and the ordinance of the Church—rubrics and ordinances which Protestant ministers have received and promised to observe,—a wish is expressed relative to the establishment of the ancient penitential courses of the Catholic Church; but, as Bingham observes, though this wish has been expressed for some hundreds of years, "nothing is done towards introducing it, but rather things are gone backward, and there is less discipline for these last sixty years, since the times of the unhappy confusions, than there was before."[1] And Bingham is but one of a mighty crowd, who felt ashamed of the service just named. To give copious extracts on this head would be superfluous. I will content myself with adducing the words of another writer, and with referring the reader to others whose sentiments and language exactly accord with the sentiments of those whose words have been already cited. "That solitary *wish* for the restoration of discipline, we yearly put up at the beginning of Lent, has, after so many repetitions, no other effect than to convince the world, that order and discipline once dropt, it is hard to raise it up again. Whither has our wishing brought us? We have wished the godly discipline used in the primitive Church at the beginning of Lent were restored. For want of something more than *wishing*, this godly discipline is sunk, and Lent itself gone after it."[2] The *wish* was obviously absurd, when and as it was uttered. It was felt formerly, as it is

[1] Bingham's Antiquities, b. xv, c. 9, § 8.

[2] The Hermit, Nos. 25 and 29. See too Marshal's Penit. Discip. of Prim. Church, p. 2, 5; White's Third Letter, p. 14; Contempt of the Clergy, p. 173, &c. &c.

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

now, that this expression of desire meant nothing; the ministers who publicly uttered it, did not desire to see the discipline of former times restored. Not only did the Anglican ritual permit, it commanded all the members of the establishment to abstain and fast; to abstain and fast for forty days; and yet it was well known that even the ministers were reading at *the head of the fast*, the Lenten service, not fasting. They had broken their fast before the hour of service, and ere the first day of Lent closed, they had partaken of meats forbidden during Lent, just as if no orders had been issued, and no wish had been expressed. Nay more, it might have been easily discovered, that so far from acting according to *the wish*, the ministers tied down to observe the ritual, looked upon fasting and abstinence as a characteristic of the great apostacy, as *the doctrine of devils* which St. Paul had ages before denounced;[3] as an observance followed indeed by Catholics, but followed by them to their own condemnation; for by their adherence to the laws of their Church, respecting abstinence, they were proved, it was asserted, to be opposed to the teaching of Christ, who had said, "understand you not, that everything from without, entering into a man, cannot defile him, because it entereth not into his heart, but goeth into the belly."[4] Such are the ordinary arguments popularly advocated by Protestants in their sermons and books. It would obviously be more consistent in this class of men, either to reject the Prayer-book, or to denounce such modes of attacking Catholicity. As long as the Prayer-book command the following vigils,—the Vigils of the Nativity of our Lord, of the Purification of the Blessed Virgin Mary, of the

[3] 1 Tim. iv, 3. [4] St. Mark vii, 18, 19.

Annunciation, of Easter, Ascension, and Pentecost, of All Saints, St. John Baptist, SS. Peter, James, Bartholomew, Matthew, Simon and Jude, Andrew, Thomas, and Matthias, as well as all the Fridays in the year to be observed as days of abstinence, and the forty days of Lent, the Ember and Rogation days to be hallowed both by *fasting and abstinence,*—so long will honest men be ashamed of those Anglicans who either violate these fasts or days of abstinence, or turn to ridicule the Catholic for observing that which, by his religion, he is bid to perform. Suffice it to say, that this contradiction of belief and practice, of prayer-book and dinner-book, has long been censured, and has extorted from the pens of Protestant writers, unwilling avowals against the Liturgy which they had solemnly pledged themselves to receive and follow.

Such is the history of, and such the dissatisfaction felt in respect to, the Liturgy. The Liturgies followed the Articles, or went along with them, in all their changes; and hence, the inference drawn from the alterations of the latter, are applicable too here. All is human in the system. Unlike the light of God's creation, man's imitation was subjected to unruled variations, and darkness was the result. Each generation would be creative. It would not believe that the past was better than the present; that the previous race of men was more enlightened, more sincere, more God-helped, than that actually existing: it rather thought that the present was better than the past,—more spiritualized, more assisted, because more experienced, and therefore it scrupled not to undo, or to take from, or to enlarge the works of those of former times. The Roman forum is a ruin, and Edom a wilderness; Jerusalem has fallen, and the glory

of Greece is as a thing that was, but which is not: why suppose that a Liturgy is imperishable, or that that which was once in honor may not become despicable? Change, then, change: let *us* build a tower, and make unto ourselves a great name. So, change after change took place; and for more than a century, articles and rituals were the toys with which sovereigns loved to play, and over which they were proud to gain the mastery. Those in power seemed to say to those who were ambitious of rank and distinction in Church and State: fall down and adore us and we will give you..... and they adored the royal teacher of the day, hoping for the reward. The compromise was made. Faith was made the slave of interest: it was an item in a worldly bargain; and the world of soul and thought became agitated by a moral earthquake, more violent, more enduring and more destructive, than any convulsion which this material globe has ever had to experience.

Before quitting the subject of the Liturgies, I would wish to draw the reader's attention to the following observation. It is a common thing to hear Protestants praising the beauty of *our* Liturgy in the same unmeasured terms as they adopt when extolling the perfection of *our* cathedrals. The Liturgy is said to be only inferior to the Sacred Scripture; it has its faults—this is allowed—but these faults are as few as can be pointed out in any human composition. Now, I would wish it to be remembered, that the Liturgy is substantially of Catholic origin. From our Missals and Breviary has been derived whatever of beauty or of excellence is to be found in the composition of that work. To advert to the Collects, these, as Palmer observes, "have been read in the Liturgies of the Church

of (in?) England from the most remote period. Not only do we find them in the Liturgies of the English Church, before the Reformation, but in those of the Anglo-Saxon Church long before the Conquest. Most of these *Collects* can, in fact, be traced to the very beginning of the Anglo-Saxon Church; and by that Church they were originally derived from the Liturgy of the Roman patriarchate in primitive times. We are thus enabled to trace them back, in many instances, to the fifth century. So that our Collects, with some exceptions, have been used for 1400 years in the Church of God; and their origin lies in the distant glory of primitive Christianity."[1] Similar observations might be made in reference to the *Gloria, Credo, Preface,* &c., and even to the order of the service constantly retained down to the unfortunate period, when the foreign reformers influenced the leaders of the English Reformation, to substitute a second ritual in place of the first Prayer-book published under the auspices of Edward VI.[2] To Catholicity, Protestantism is indebted for the beauties of the English Liturgy. It is as much indebted to Catholicity for these, as for those gorgeous and stupendous fabrics, cathedrals and monastic churches, which still, after ages of ruin and destruction, stud the English soil. To be sure, the *sacrifice* and the *altar* are banished from the Liturgy, as they have been from the temple; and many an excrescence and anomaly spoils the nearly inspired composition, as does many a modern window, or table, or pew, spoil the gothic sublimity of the material structure. But these are innovations, alterations; for these, Catholicity is not responsible. It is responsible

[1] Palmer, Orig. Liturg., vol. ii, 39, 40.

[2] For details I refer the reader to the work just cited.

only for what is ancient, venerable, true, elevating; for that, through and by which the spirits of the primitive and medieval saints magnified their God and Saviour: it has nothing to do with the novel, the uncatholic; with that, in a word, which makes a man a member of an Anglican, whilst it tears him away from the Catholic Church. These few remarks, on a subject which admits of almost any extent of development, have been made for one object: to do that justice to those who have gone before us, which has been well expressed in one brief sentence—REDDE CUIQUE SUUM.

Chapter the Sixth.

On the Royal Supremacy.

CONTENTS.

At the accession of Henry, not the King, but the Pope was head of the English Church.—His power considered to be divine, and as such defended by Henry himself.—Henry's work—The title conferred on him in consequence.—Henry abandons the Pope, and makes himself head of the Church.—His conduct, and that of the Clergy, during the change.—Awful extent of the royal assumption—Secured to him by Acts of Parliament, by oaths, &c.—Subserviency of the Clergy, and their subsequent abject condition.—More and Fisher die in defence of the Papal Supremacy.—Edward's claims to and exercise of the Supremacy.—Remonstrance of the Clergy.—Indignation of the German and Helvetic Reformers.—Elizabeth refuses the title of *Head*, but assumes that of *Governor* of the Church, with all the prerogatives of the Supremacy.—Remarks on the change in the title, by the Anglicans and others.—Opposition of the Catholic Clergy to Elizabeth's claims to the Supremacy.—Results.—The Supremacy ever since claimed by and allowed to our Sovereigns by Parliament.—Grounds raised for the maintenance of the Supremacy proved to be untenable.—Consequences to England's Christianity flowing from the assumed Supremacy.—Folly of the recent address made to the Queen, relative to the Independence of the Church in England.—The scriptural proof in favour of the Royal Supremacy, false as a fact, and absurd as an argument.—No *mission* in the Anglican Church.—The marks of the Church have disappeared here ever since a King was substituted for the Pope.

When the founder of the Anglican Reformation ascended the English throne, he found England united through

the Roman Pontiff to the rest of Christendom. Each prelate swore obedience to the Supreme Pontiff; the papal nuncio sat in the council chamber of the English Sovereign; and the Sovereign himself had recourse in the hour of difficulty to his Spiritual Superior at Rome, whom he honored as a Father, and from whom he sued for a dispensation, in case the royal wishes seemed opposed to the positive enactments of the Pope. Henry did more. He wrote a work, partly in defence of the Supremacy of Rome, against Luther; and in this work he expressed his wonder at the audacity of the man who had dared, in opposition to all actual and former testimony in favour of the undoubted right of the Pope to rule the Catholic world, to deny this authority. This work he dedicated to His Holiness Leo X, from whom in return he received the distinctive title, still assumed by the Sovereigns of this kingdom, of *Defender of the Faith!*—the faith of Rome. The authority too of the Pope was believed to be of divine right. Christ had built his *Church* upon one; upon Peter. To him he had committed the charge of the whole flock. He was to feed and rule the lambs and sheep of this flock. The Church was not to cease. It was built upon a rock, to last; to continue despite of the winds and the storms, and the machinations of power in its worst and most terrific forms. It was to continue on *the rock.* Peter was to uphold for ever the divine Establishment; to feed the flock and to rule it for ever. He was never to die, as it were, for his race was ever-existing. His power was to endure, and his power was inalienable. Whoever succeeded Peter, he it was who was to support, and sustain the Church. On him, all who professed the heaven-born creed rested; by him all were supported;

and through him this prophecy was to be fulfilled—"*the gates of hell shall not prevail against the Church.*" Such was the faith of England before the Reformation, down to the year 1534; such is the faith of every portion of Christendom at the present hour, where heresy has not supplanted the ancient creed, and introduced novelty for antiquity. The Bishops all over the world, here and elsewhere, believed that the plenitude of Ecclesiastical jurisdiction was centred in His Holiness, and was through him communicated to the prelates who ruled over the various dioceses into which the Church was divided. Our Archbishops and others might indeed be elected by the crown, but such elections conferred no Ecclesiastical power till Rome's acquiescence had been obtained. Then but then only, did they rule a portion of the Church of God, when the Pontiff of Rome had admitted them to the honors and responsibilities of the Episcopate.[1]

Disappointed in his expectations of procuring from Clement a divorce, Henry, notwithstanding the belief of his fathers, and his own published professions, resolved to carry out the suggestion of his unprincipled favourite, Cromwell, namely to separate from the Holy See, and to make himself the centre of Anglican unity, and the source of all ecclesiastical as well as civil jurisdiction in this realm: in other words, the Monarch determined on proclaiming himself the Pope, as well as the King of England. The clergy were amazed at the proposal; and anxious to save their consciences as well as the royal favour, they agreed in convocation to call him *the Supreme head,* as

[1] I have treated this subject so fully in my recent work, "*England and Rome.*" that I shall forego the labour of entering again on this matter. I remit the reader to the work referred to.

far as the law of Christ permitted this: "*Et quantum per Christi legem licet, etiam supremum caput ipsius majestatem recognoscimus.*"[2] But Henry heeded not this *quantum*, or the protestations either of the Primate Warham, or of Tunstall, Bishop of Durham, against this title, and all statutes in derogation of the authority of the Holy See. He bound the clergy, "on the word of a priest," to obey him in all spiritual matters; and rather than incur the royal displeasure, the spiritual order basely yielded.[3] Law after law was quickly passed, to extend the regal and destroy the papal power. The Archbishop was told by the Monarch, that, "We do recognize no superior in earth, but only God," and that "because ye be under us by God's calling and ours, the most principal minister *of our spiritual jurisdiction* within this our realm,[4] we do not refuse to allow you to dissolve our marriage with Catherine of Arragon." The divorce, which had been sought in vain from Rome, was conceded by Cranmer, and the uxorious Monarch was, five days afterwards, declared the lawful husband of Anne Boleyn.[5] The King, too, was, as a last authority, to be appealed to.[6] Recourse was no longer to be had to the Holy See for confirmation, which confirmation conferred on the prelate jurisdiction, but to the king only;[7] and even the archiepiscopal badge, the pallium, was to be conferred by the authority of this unconsecrated King-Pope. Dispensations might be granted by the ecclesiastical authorities, but not without *the royal license*;[8] and so far was the Pope's power ignored, that to appeal to him was made a crime, and even the very name

[2] Wilkins, iii, 742-5.
[3] Wilkins, iii, 754-5.
[4] Collier, ii; Records, No. 24.
[5] Wilkins, iii, 804.
[6] 25 Henry VIII, c. 19.
[7] Ibid. c. 20
[8] C. 21.

of the Pontiff was carefully expunged from all books of divine service. Henry, as also his heirs and successors, were declared by the statute,[1] "to have full power and authority, from time to time, to visit, repress, redress, reform, order, correct, restrain and amend, all such errors, heresies, abuses, &c., which by any manner, spiritual authority, or jurisdiction, ought or may be lawfully reformed, repressed, ordered, redressed, corrected," &c.; it was also declared, that the Sovereign had "secluded out of this realm, the abuses of the Bishop of Rome, his authority and jurisdiction, of long time usurped" (how delighted would not Luther have felt, to find that the royal theologian had forgotten his own arguments in proof of the absurdity of this alleged usurpation!); and that, "the bishops utterly renounced all oaths and obedience to any foreign potentates, and all foreign jurisdictions and powers, as well of the Bishop of Rome as of all other, whatsoever they be."[2] Finally, to finish this history of usurpation, the lay ruler of the Church chose a layman, Cromwell, for his vicar-general, who took the precedence even of the Primate of England; and the Sovereign was at length *declared* to be, what he had all along assumed to be, the source of all jurisdiction, both ecclesiastical and secular: "Quandoquidem .... jurisdictio omminoda, tam illa quæ ecclesiastica dicitur, quam secularis, a regiâ potestate, velut a supremo capite....primitus emanaverit."[3] It was further enacted, by the 35 Henry VIII, c. 1, that the following oath should be taken by persons at their ordinations, at

[1] 26 Henry VIII, c. 1.

[2] To what an extent the clergy and the Universities carried their subserviency, may be seen in Wilkins, iii, 769, 771, et seqq.

[3] Wilkins, iii, 797-8.

institutions to benefices, at admissions to degrees at the Universities, and by every person at the King's pleasure: "I, N.N., having now the veil of darkness of the usurped power, authority, and jurisdiction, of the See and Bishop of Rome, clearly taken away from mine eyes, do utterly testify and declare in my conscience, that neither the See nor the Bishop of Rome, nor any foreign potentate, hath, nor ought to have, any jurisdiction, power, or authority within this realm, neither by God's law, nor by any other just law or means. .... I .... now do freely and clearly renounce, refuse, relinquish, and forsake that pretended authority, power, and jurisdiction, both of the See and Bishop of Rome, and of all other foreign powers .... and that I shall accept, repute, and take the King's majesty, his heirs and successors, when they, or any of them, shall enjoy his place, to be the only Supreme head of the Church of England and Ireland, in earth, under God, and in all other his highness' dominions. And that with my body, cunning, wit .... I shall observe, keep, maintain, and defend all the King's majesty's styles, titles, and rights, with the whole effects and contents of the acts provided for the same, and all other acts and statutes made, or to be made within this realm, in and for that purpose. . . ."[4]

Thus the English Church was tied to the throne: it depended entirely upon it. The King was its spiritual head, and the bishops were solely his assistants: they partook of a share of that power of which he enjoyed the plenitude.[5]

With the results of this assumption of power, all the

[4] See Lewis's notes on the nature and extent of the royal Supremacy in the Anglican Church, p. 31, &c.

[5] Wilkins, iii, 784.

world is acquainted. Fisher and More, and afterwards numbers of others, refused to concede to Henry and his heirs what belonged to the Roman Pontiff; and for this legal crime, they were condemned to pay the forfeit of their lives. The scaffold was stained with the blood of many a good and conscientious Englishman; and England became a huge Haceldema, when the peaceful Pontiff was rejected, and the Sovereign usurped the power and prerogatives of the Bishop of Rome.

The boy-pope, Edward VI, under such men as Cranmer and Somerset, was not likely to abandon the character assumed by his father. In his reign, indeed, the spiritual power was more distinctly made to emanate from the crown. The King only had the inherent right to visit the dioceses; to him was committed the absolute appointment of his Vicegerents; and from him, "authority of jurisdiction, spiritual and temporal, was derived and deduced."[1] The result of all these enactments was, that the Clergy became absolutely powerless. They soon discovered that, not only had the Pontiff's power been taken away, but theirs too had been destroyed; and to obviate the inconvenience to which they were subjected, the lower order of Clergy requested that they might be permitted to sit in the House of Commons when matters connected with religion were being discussed. But this request was indignantly refused. The Commons pro-

[1] 1 Edward VI, c. 2. Previously indeed, this wide expression had been used in the *Reformatio. Leg. Ecclesiast.* tit. de officio et Jurisd. omnium Judicum. "Rex tam in Episcopos, Clericos, etc., quam in Laicos, plenissimam jurisdictionem tam civilem quam Ecclesiasticam exercere potest; *cum omnis jurisdictio et Ecclesiastica et secularis ab eo tanquam ex uno et eodem fonte derivatur.*"

ceeded in their former course, and without consulting the Clergy, passed their decrees relative to religion. (See *Antiq. Britan.* p. 339.) *Their wings were indeed clipped*, as Heylin somewhere expresses it: and the Clergy, when it was too late, discovered that the real governors of the Church were the King and his Parliament. These passed laws, and made articles of faith; and the Clergy were bid to subscribe and enforce the observance of the new enactments. The Clergy became in fact, neither more nor less than royal bailiffs, or parliamentary officers. Calvin was indignant when he beheld the Clergy of England cringing and fawning at the footstool of power.[2] Not content with calling the sycophants, *inconsiderate* in their concessions, he proceeded to use harsher language: he styled them *blasphemers*, because they had named the King, the Supreme Head of the Church under Christ. But it was when Elizabeth claimed the Supremacy, that the German Reformers' indignation reached its height. When Chemnitz heard of the astounding event of Elizabeth's claims to Anglican Supremacy, he indignantly exclaimed: "*Fœmineo fastu et a seculis inaudito.*" Mary, like a virtuous Catholic, rejected the usurped power of Spiritual Supremacy, and restored it again to the Roman Pontiff: but her acts were again rescinded, and Elizabeth became the Spiritual Head of the Anglican Establishment. She refused indeed the title of *Head* of the Church; and by doing so, seems to

[2] Qui initio tantopere extulerunt Henricum Regem Angliæ certe fuerunt inconsiderati homines. Dederunt illi summam rerum omnium potestatem; et hoc me semper graviter vulneravit: erant enim blasphemi, cum vocarent ipsum, summum caput Ecclesiæ sub Christo. *Calvin in Caput 7 Amos.*

have afforded satisfaction to Jewel and his partizans: but she assumed another title equally significative, the title of Governor;[1] and further, she claimed all the power, and rights, and jurisdiction, which her father and brother had been possessed of, during the palmiest days of their Ecclesiastical ascendency. It was decreed (1 Eliz. c. 1, and 8 Eliz. c. 1) that "all jurisdictions, privileges, superiorities, spiritual and ecclesiastical, as by *any* spiritual or ecclesiastical power hath heretofore been exercised, for the visitation of ecclesiastical state and persons, and for reformation, order, and correction of the same, and of all manner of errors, heresies, schisms, &c., shall for ever, by authority of this Parliament, be united and annexed to the Imperial Crown of this realm, &c." And in the same Act, it was ordained, in reference to the extent of the Queen's Supremacy, that "the branches, sentences, and words of the said several Acts (made in the time of Henry VIII), and every one of them, shall be deemed and taken to extend to your Highness, as fully and largely as ever the same Acts did extend to the said late King Henry VIII, your Highnesses father." The Clergy, who knew the meaning of these statutes, and who had seen Henry and Edward claiming, in virtue of them, a right to crush the vital powers and energies of the ministers of religion, and to rule them more absolutely than the Roman Pontiff could have done by right of his Supremacy, would not consent to the enactments: they clung to the

[1] "The Queen is not willing to be called the *Head* of the Church of England, *although this title has been offered her;* but she willingly accepts the title of *Governor*, which amounts to the same thing." Zurich Letters, May 21, 1559, *first series*, p. 29; see too Jewel's Letter, May 22, 1559, p. 33, &c.

Pontiff as their Spiritual Head, and rejected the Queen in quality of Supreme Governor of the Church in England. In the fourth Article of their defence of the ancient and divinely established form of Church Headship, they declared—"that to Blessed Peter, and his legitimate successors in the Apostolic See, as to Christ's Vicar, was given the supreme power of feeding and governing the Church militant of Christ, and confirming his brethren."[2] And in the fifth Article they distinctly affirmed that "not to laymen, but to clergymen only, was the power granted by God of judging and defining in matters connected with faith."[3]

Succeeding Sovereigns claimed the powers conceded to their predecessors. James, in the plenitude of his power, restored to the homicide, Archbishop Abbot, the exercise of his forfeited spiritual faculties. Charles the First suspended Abbot; ratified again the Articles, and attached to them a meaning which the House of Commons in vain protested against. The Second Charles allowed of deviations from the Rubric on the 25th October, 1660, and dispensed with the subscription to the three Articles of the Thirty-sixth Canon, and the oath of Canonical obedience. Even the Dutch King, William III, was a zealous maintainer of the rights of his Supremacy, whatever his own personal convictions might be in relation to the orthodoxy of the Establishment. He deprived several Bishops of their Sees, and issued injunctions to the Archbishops, which they were accordingly bound to communi-

[2] See the Articles of this most important meeting in Fuller's History, l. ix, p. 54. He copied them out of the Lib. Syn., 1559.

[3] On all these questions see the excellent work, *A Relation of the English Reformation,* Oxford, 1687.

cate to their suffragans.[1] Anne informed the Primate, that she was determined to maintain the Supremacy, as a fundamental part of the constitution of the Church of England.[2] And thus have our Monarchs, from year to year, down to the present period, continued to claim and exercise the prerogatives of the Supremacy: they proclaimed themselves to be the Spiritual Heads of the Prelates, and of the Church in general, and prelates and people swore to defend this Supremacy. Queen Victoria, like her predecessors, has exercised as well as asserted the rights of the Supremacy. It was ordained in the Statute 6 and 7 Vict. c. 62, that "if a Bishop become incapable of performing his functions, it shall be lawful for her Majesty, by letters patent under the great seal, to appoint one of the bishops of the same province....to exercise all the functions and powers, as well with regard to the temporalities as spiritualities of the Bishop or Archbishop so found to have become incapable." And in a recent meeting of convocation, the following words were agreed upon, as an address to Her Majesty: "We not only recognize, but highly prize your Majesty's undoubted Supremacy in all causes, ecclesiastical and civil, over all persons, and in every part of your Majesty's dominions, as it was maintained in ancient times against the usurpations of the See of Rome, and was recovered and reasserted at our Reformation. In connexion with this grave subject, we feel that your Majesty may expect from us the expression of our solemn protest against that fresh aggression of the Bishop of Rome, by which he has arrogated to himself the spiritual charge of this nation, thereby denying the existence of that branch of the Church Catho-

[1] Wilkins, iv, 624. [2] Ibid. 625.

lic which was planted in Britain in the primitive ages of Christianity, and has been preserved by a merciful Providence to this day, as well as against many which have preceded it: and we desire, on this our first occasion of addressing your Majesty since its occurrence, solemnly to protest in the face of Christendom, and to lay this our protest before your Most Gracious Majesty."[3]

This Supremacy was said too, to be of divine origin. By the 37, Henry VIII, c. 17, it was expressly declared, that the Spiritual Headship was given to the Monarch by heaven, a revelation to this effect being indeed expressly recorded in the Holy Scriptures. "In consideration (it was said) that *your Majesty is the only and undoubted Supreme Head, &c., to whom, by Holy Scripture, all power and authority is wholly given, to determine all manner of causes ecclesiastical, and to correct vice, &c., may it therefore be enacted that all persons as well lay as those that are married, being doctors of the civil law, who shall be deputed to be any chancellor, commissary, &c., may lawfully exercise* ALL MANNER *of jurisdiction, commonly called ecclesiastical jurisdiction,* any constitution to the contrary notwithstanding."

Whether or not, God and his holy word were thought of by Cromwell who suggested, or by Henry who adopted the idea of making the Sovereign of the land the Head of the religion of the country, I leave the reader to judge. This however is evident: the assumption of this authority enabled Henry to gratify his passions, and Henry's successors to wreak their vengeance on the Pontiff who dared to pronounce his anathemas against kings and queens, and on those who still clung, despite of legal enact-

[3] See the Journals of the 27th November, 1852.

ments, to the rock of their fathers, and gloried in their dependence on the noble line of Peter's successors. But the Royal Supremacy was attended with great inconveniences. For 1° this doctrine tore England away from the rest of the world. Prior to the Reformation, the Church in England was a branch of the Church Catholic. With it, all the Churches of the world were in union. They all offered up the same sacrifice, received the same sacraments, believed the same doctrines, and acknowledged the same Head, the Pontiff of Rome. To this Pontiff, every court resorted, and none more so than that of England; even down to the period when Henry felt, or affected to feel, scruples on account of his marriage with his brother's widow. But, by making the Sovereign Head of the Church here, a new doctrine was established; a doctrine which the Roman Church and the Catholic world repudiated, ascribing, and rightly too, its origin to passion and to revenge. This new doctrine made this *an Insular Church*; the Church not *in* but *of* England; the Church not as before constituted, but as established by an Act of Parliament, which had no power (this is universally acknowledged) out of the realm of England; it ceased to be a portion of the Catholic Church of which the successor of St. Peter was the Head. England did not even after that affect to be a branch of the Catholic Church: it was the Protestant Church: *it* was a whole. It had no connexion whatsoever even with Lutheranism or Calvinism, or the Greek Church: it was lopped off from every other Established Church. Christianity, after 1500 years, was reduced in the Anglican hypothesis to a few hundred worshippers, placed in the sea girt island, of whom "the impersonation of evil" was the first head!

The prayer of Christ for unity was rendered abortive, when the English Sovereign claimed to be the Spiritual Head of the Church in his kingdom. The principle advocated was one of disunion, of severance, of isolation: it broke up the Catholic Church: it made the world consist of as many petty and independent Churches as there were kingdoms, or dukedoms, or republics; for assuredly no Englishman was so foolish as to say, that it was permitted to the English Sovereign only to rule a portion of the Church; that he had a privilege which was denied to other temporal Rulers; and what would be usurpation on the part of the Pontiff here, would be the ordinance of heaven for France, Germany, Austria, and Bavaria, and for Russia, Poland, Hungary, Portugal, Spain, and Switzerland. Without an universal Head, where would be *the* Catholic Church? If the Anglican Church was a branch of the Church, as some writers have maintained in *this* century, after her separation from Rome, could that branch be anything but a lopped-off, rotten, condemned branch—a branch only fit for the fire? It was joined to no *stock;* it branched off from no trunk; it derived no sap, no vitality from any root: surely it was dead! Instead of speaking of the branch Church of England, the members of the late convocation should have explained their meaning. For years the explanation has been demanded; it has been demanded by the learned of Italy, and France and England; the request should be attended to. To others the word appears absurd; has it a meaning even in the minds of those who have just adopted it? If it have, let the meaning be assigned. Let it be shown that the Anglican Church is anything better than a condemned, lopped-off branch—a branch which has no fruit,

which has no life. Let it be shown with what it is connected; where is its root, and where the trunk with which it is immediately and essentially united.

2° The Royal Supremacy is in direct opposition to the councils received by the English Church. The new Church receives the four first General Councils, namely, those of Nice, Constantinople, Chalcedon, and Ephesus. Now, it is easy to show from these, that so far from rejecting the Roman and believing in a kingly Spiritual Supremacy, the fathers of these councils plainly considered the Roman Pontiff to be the Head of the Church, of the whole of Christendom. I will draw the reader's attention to what was respectively said by the prelates assembled at Chalcedon and Ephesus. 1° They declare that Pope Leo, "had presided over them, through his delegates, as a head over the members;" that to him "the guardianship of *the vineyard* had been entrusted by the Lord;" "we have confirmed (they add) the Canon promulgated by the hundred and fifty fathers who assembled at Constantinople, ... that after your most blessed and apostolic (throne) that of Constantinople should have the primacy. Being persuaded that, as the apostolic ray shines with you, you will often extend it to this city of Constantinople....We therefore call upon you to honor also with your sanction our judgment. Even as we have brought our harmonious agreement unto the head in (all) good things, so also let *the head* do what is befitting for *the children*. For thus also will the religious Sovereigns be reverenced, who have confirmed the decision of your Holiness as a law; and the throne of Constantinople will make you a return as it has ever fully exhibited all zeal towards the things disposed by you in the cause of

true religion, and has zealously united itself with you in oneness of sentiment." (*Epist. Synod. Leoni, t.* iv, *Concil. col.* 836-8, *Labbei.*)

See too, how plainly the Papal legate, Phillip, speaks in respect to the acknowledged Supremacy of Rome, in the Council of Ephesus. "It is a matter of doubt to none, yea, rather, it is a thing known to all ages, that the holy and most blessed Peter, the prince and head of the Apostles, the pillar of the faith, the foundation of the Catholic Church, received the keys of the kingdom from Jesus Christ, our Lord and Saviour, and Redeemer of Mankind: and to him was given authority to bind and loose sins: who even till this present, and always, both lives and judges in his successors. Our holy and most blessed Pope Celestine, the bishop, the canonical successor and vicegerent of this Peter, has sent us as representatives of his person."—*Concil. Eph.* t. iii, act. iii, col. 625; *Concil. Labbei.* Previously to this declaration, which was joyfully listened to by the prelates, they had "united (in receiving the letters of the Pontiff,) their holy members, by their holy voices and acclamation, to that holy head (the Pope)." —*Ibid.* act. ii, col. 619. Such is the language which the Eastern prelates as well as the Eastern Sovereigns, adopted in reference to the Roman Pontiff. He is their head and their father, and they are his members and his children. The Pope is the guardian of the Lord's vineyard, not of a portion of it, but of the entire vineyard; and whatever authority, after the Holy See, Constantinople is to be possessed of, that authority, it is known, is to be derived from the Holy See; and hence it is that the fathers humbly petition his Holiness to accede to their wishes, and confer on the second Rome, an extension of privileges

and jurisdiction: and to further their ends, they declare what zeal they have ever felt for the Holy See, and what anxiety they have ever exhibited to be one in sentiment with it. The words uttered in the Council of Ephesus require no comment. Similar language was formerly used, as I have already shewn, in a recent publication, by the prelates and kings of England, in their addresses to the Holy See. To the Roman Pontiff they were wont to repair for spiritual favours; to his judgment they submitted their decrees; and in virtue of his decisions were greater as well as minor ecclesiastical affairs arranged. In fact, the language of England was ordinarily even more orthodox and more filial, when no momentary excitement agitated the breasts either of the sovereign or of the hierarchy, towards Rome, than that of any other country: this I could easily prove, but I shall not do so here, since I have elsewhere already entered fully into this important and truly interesting subject.[1] Now in the face of these statements made by the councils which Protestantism professes to receive,[2] is it not folly, or something worse, to cast off the authority of the Pontiff, and recognize that of the Sovereign, in matters spiritual.

Thirdly, if the Sovereign, as such, be the head of the Church, then it must be admitted either that the Church had no head for more than three hundred years, or that pagans were the heads of this divine system. The latter position is ridiculous; it is ridiculous to suppose that Christ placed the regulation of the affairs of Christianity in the hands of infidel sovereigns, whose most ardent desire was this—to exterminate the Christian name; and who, to realize their wish, waged a continuous war of

[1] See "*England and Rome*," *passim*. [2] See Burnet's Articles, p. 207.

persecution for nearly three hundred years against the Church, filling prison after prison with crowds of believers, purpling the scaffold with the blood of Christians, and hurrying to the lions numbers for the only crime of abandoning paganism, and professing their adherence to the Messias. If the former position be maintained, if it be said that it was headless for three hundred years and more, then I ask, on what authority is it stated that the Church could be in such an anomalous position? Further, where is it stated that when, after three hundred years, an emperor should profess the faith, he was to become the visible spiritual head of the Church of his empire, the rest of the world still remaining acephalous, because still governed, and to be governed for ages to come, by infidels. These are important positions, and not to be maintained at random, or to be admitted without evidence. They are positions of vital importance, if Anglican principles are deserving of the slightest attention. I find in the sacred Scriptures of Christianity, one Peter appointed to feed the flock; I find that the Church, built on *this* Peter, is perpetually to endure; I find Christ commissioning Apostles—*fishermen, not kings*—to go and preach to all mankind, and these ordaining others to supply their places, in order that the ministerial line may continue after their demise; and I further learn, that with this line, Christ promises to be all the days, even to the end of the world; but I do not find a king appointed to rule, to govern the Church; I do not find monarchs commissioned to arrange the affairs of the Church. I find Apostles and their successors, openly resisting the orders of the rulers of the day, and declaring that bishops were appointed by the Holy Ghost, to rule the Church; but in

vain have I sought for any warrantee of Holy Writ, in favour of the supposition, that the Sovereign of England, man or woman it matters not, or the sovereign of any other land, has been appointed as such, to be the supreme head or the supreme governor of the Church of the living God. And yet, as we have seen, this authority was distinctly maintained to be given by Holy Writ to Henry and his successors! Why has not the chapter, the verse, the book been pointed out? Why are we condemned to search and search in vain for the portentous text? Why, in a matter of such moment, is it not tacked to the throne, written upon the walls, fastened on the brow of royalty? *There is no such text;* the declaration is false, as false as the fact which it would sustain. Had there been such a text, it would have been long ago paraded through the world.

Further, in the Holy Scripture, the Church is called *the kingdom of Christ; the flock* of the Redeemer; *the* city placed on the mountain top: it is one. But the Anglican idea destroys this unity; there must be kingdoms, and flocks, and cities, to make it convey any meaning: kingdoms, having each a distinctive spiritual ruler; and flocks, having each its independent shepherd; and cities, wholly disconnected, separated, divided one from the other. In Italy, France, Austria, Portugal, and Spain, Catholic sovereigns shall, by the appointment of Heaven, rule the Church; in Russia, a schismatical Greek shall be supreme; in Germany, and Switzerland, and Prussia, Lutheran and Calvinistic princes shall be sent by God, to maintain systems diametrically opposed to those upheld in England and elsewhere. Catholic princes may be, and by divine appointment, heads of the Church in other countries, but here it may not be so. Should Queen

Victoria, the head of the English Church, return to the faith of her fathers, she forfeits her title; her loyal and *spiritual subjects are absolved from their allegiance*, and the crown descends to the next Protestant heir, as if the Queen were naturally dead; for so the Calvinistic Dutchman, William III, King of England, *and head of the Anglican Church*, willed it![1] And thus God is made a god of inconsistencies and contradictions; and he who said that he desired unity of belief, and who indeed made this unity essential to salvation, as well as to Christianity, rendered this unity impossible by forcing the people to obey *heads*, professing contradictory creeds, and promulgating contradictory enactments connected with the important affair of religion.

If kings be, by Holy Writ, appointed to rule the Church, if from them, all spiritual jurisdiction flows, if they be the judges of heresy, how comes it to pass, that no king, no queen, no emperor, no empress, no head of a republic, ever believed in or acknowledged such a tenet before Henry's love for Boleyn, and the unscrupulous advice of Cromwell, suggested the new idea. The first Christian emperor did not deem himself to have been made by his baptism head of the Church. Judge of this from his own words: "God," he says, "has constituted you priests, and given you power to judge us; and therefore we are rightly judged by you, but you cannot be judged by men."[2]

Nor did the sainted prelates of Christendom look upon sovereigns as their spiritual lords. "What," asks St. Athanasius, "has the emperor to do with the judgments of

[1] 1 William and Mary, c. 2.

[2] Rufinus, l. i, c. 1; S. Greg. l. iv, Epist. 72; also Baronius, ad ann. 325.

of bishops? Has it ever been heard of, since the beginning of the world, that the judgments of the Church derived their force from the emperor?"[1] And when Osius had occasion to correct the Arian, Constantius, he makes use of very unmistakeable language: "Meddle not, O Emperor," he exclaimed, "in ecclesiastical causes, nor take upon you to command us in this kind, but rather learn those things from us. To you God has committed the empire; to us the affairs of the Church."[2] S. Ambrose also knew well what was the extent of the imperial, and what of the episcopal power, in matters of religion. Dalmatius the tribune, having been sent with a public notary, by Valentinian the younger, to summon S. Ambrose to dispute with the Arian bishop, Auxentius, received the following reply from the illustrious doctor of the Church: "I answered," says S. Ambrose, in his letter to the Emperor, "in the same manner as your glorious father did on a like occasion, not only in words, by also by laws, that in causes of faith and ecclesiastical order, priests only are to judge priests; and further, that should a bishop be questioned for his conduct, this judgment should likewise appertain to bishops. When did you ever hear, most clement Emperor, that laymen judged bishops in matters of faith? You are yet young in years; you will, by God's grace, and the maturity of your age, be better informed hereafter; and then will you be able better to judge what kind of bishop he is to be accounted, who subjects the rights of the priesthood to laymen. Your father, being a man of riper years, said, 'it belongs not to me to be a judge among bishops:' and will your cle-

[1] Epist. ad Solitar.

[2] Epist. ad Constant. apud Baronium ad ann. 355.

mency now say, that you ought to be their judge?"[3] But it is not requisite to draw the reader's attention to the sovereigns of other lands; the question is, *did any English sovereign*, prior to the times of Henry, ever pretend either to be *the head* of the Church as a Church, or to be possessed of the jurisdiction claimed by Rome, and to be the source, the origin of ecclesiastical authority. No: seven Saxon kings, and another king of Danish origin, repaired to Rome to receive the blessing of the Pontiff, whom they called father, and head of the Church; and on him, they and their subjects declared themselves to be necessarily dependent in all Church matters. These were Cæadwalla, Ine, Offa, Cœnred, Offa, Siric, Ethelwulf, and Canute. They, like their predecessors, sued for the Pontifical blessing, deeming it a great privilege to receive the benediction of the father of the faithful;[4] and if they wished for an extension of the hierarchy, or for a fresh disposition in the ecclesiastical arrangements of the kingdom, they had recourse to Rome; leaving to the Pontiff the right to concede or refuse their petitions. In this manner acted King Offa; and a similar line of conduct was pursued by other sovereigns who successively filled the English throne. Gregory, surnamed the Great, was the first who arranged the sees of England; "Vitalian placed all the Anglo-Saxon Churches under the jurisdiction of Theodore; Agatho limited the number of bishops to one metropolitan and eleven suffragans; Leo I established a second metropolitan at York; Adrian, a third at Lichfield; Leo III revoked the grant to Lichfield, and confirmed to the

[3] Epist. l. v; Epist. 32.

[4] Epist. Cænulphi, R. Leoni Papæ; Wilkins, 164; see also Sax. Chron. 86, 89, 90.

Church of Canterbury that precedence of rank and authority which it has always possessed since the eighth century."[1] In fact, what is the ecclesiastical history of our Country, save a constant succession of appeals to Rome, by kings and bishops; of confirmations of bishops and of supplications for the pallium; of transmission to Rome of conciliary acts, and approbation of them by the Holy Father; of instructions issued from the Holy See to the prelates and others, for the well-being of the Church in England; of approval and ratification of royal and other charters; of privileges granted to the kings or particular sees; of gatherings of Peter-pence; of visits to Rome and to other cities in order to assist at councils convened by order of his Holiness; of condemnations of heresies; of ecclesiastical censures extending to the whole country, as in the case of interdicts; or of occasional contests with regard to presentations, benefices, and provisors. The spirit of the Pontiff hovered over people, king, and priest. The idea had never been entertained of placing the Church under a lay sovereign, nor had kings assumed to be the heads of the Church, and the sources of all ecclesiastical jurisdiction. This was a misfortune reserved for the sixteenth century, when priest and people deserved the chastisement and abandonment of heaven. Blot out, during any previous period, the name and deeds of the Pontiff of Rome, from the annals of our ecclesiastical history, and you will find that the page of history is a —— blank.[2] Indeed, from the fact of England's

[1] Lingard's Anglo Sax. Church, vol. i, 118.

[2] My History of "Rome and England" is one continuous proof of England's submission to the Holy See, from the third to the sixteenth century. To this work I again remit my readers.

Catholicity, may be readily inferred, what was England's belief in respect of the Holy See. Catholicity was based on the Popedom, and he was no Catholic, in the language of the times, who was not governed by the Pontiff. What St. Jerome said of the Holy See in his days, was said by every person here, who professed to belong to the olden creed: "Following no chief but Christ, I am joined in communion with your Holiness, that is, with the chair of Peter."[3] Men may, like the members of *Convocation*, speak of the *ancient British Church*, whose independence they assume; but the world at large, and scholars in particular, will laugh at this way of evading a fact. If we know anything about a British Church, this knowledge is reduced to seven heads: 1° A Roman Pontiff sent missioners hither, at the request of King Lucius, to convert the Britons. 2° These Britons professed the faith of Rome, which faith was guarded by another Pontiff, Celestine, when exposed to the insidious attacks of Pelagius. 3° The doctrines and practices of the British Church were those which the missioners had learned in the Eternal City. 4° This Church had been nearly exterminated by the perfidious conduct of the Saxon, when Augustine arrived on the English coast. 5° Still in doctrine it remained the same as before, though in some *practices*, owing to a want of communication with other Churches, and the disorders of the times, it differed from the universal Church. 6° Augustine was rejected, not on doctrinal grounds, but on the ground of being proud; but 7° Eventually, obedience was paid to the Papal representative, and Briton and Saxon forgot the misdeeds or injustices of their forefathers, and at last, not only professed the same creed,

[3] Epis. xv, ad Damasum Papam. Nos. 1, 2.

but laboured strenuously together to spread it everywhere. This we know, but no more. If the Anglican seek for a royal head, who ruled the British Church, he will seek in vain; he will seek as uselessly for this doctrine of Anglicanism among the Britons, Saxons, Danes and Normans, as for these others: that the Mass is a blasphemous fable; that the vows of religion and the monastic state are to be disallowed; that Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus are only apocryphal works; and that there is no authority across the seas, to which recourse may be had for the procuration of ecclesiastical dignities. Mass was daily offered up; the Catholic Scriptures were received as divine; vows were taken, and the holy cowled fraternity was reverenced by the British Church, as is evident from the writings of Gildas, 72, 76, 69, 71, as well as by the Saxons and their followers. Why speak of an independent British Church without knowing or referring to either its ecclesiastical form of government, its doctrines, or its origin?

I have not noticed, nor is it indeed necessary to notice, the examples ordinarily adduced from the Scriptures of the Old Law, in favour of the Anglican notion of supremacy; for obviously such Scriptures neither do nor can establish the position, that in the Christian dispensation, kings are the spiritual heads of Christ's Church. The question is not, what arrangements did God make for the Church of *one favoured people* prior to the advent of his Son, but what arrangements were made for the one Church of all nations, after Christ had assumed our nature and appeared amongst us. It is to evade the question, to argue from one order of things to another of a higher character, to pass from a particular to an universal propo-

sition, to infer, that *because* under the Judaical dispensation such a system was established, therefore that same system was to be a portion of Christianity. But in fact even the statement made in reference to the Old Law is not true: kings, as such, were not the spiritual heads of the Jewish Church; the priest was the head. "It doth not belong to thee, Ozias, to burn incense to the Lord, but to the priests, that is to the sons of Aaron, who are consecrated for this ministry."—*2 Par.* xxvi, 18.[1]

In fine, mere laics, such as our kings and queens are, were always considered incompetent as such to confer spiritual jurisdiction, they themselves being, by the appointment of Christ, cut off from such a power. A great branch of spiritual jurisdiction consists in the power of binding and loosing, of forgiving and retaining sins. To the first ministers of religion this power was given. It was an important power; one which the Church soon made use of,—a power too which, if words mean anything, is still claimed by the Anglican Church. If kings and queens be the sources of all jurisdiction, if others be merely *their vicegerents*, and exercise their powers dependently on them, it will be conceded, that majesty itself holds the spiritual keys, and can bind and loose, forgive and retain sins. Now, have laymen this power? The ministerial or spiritual power is not dependant, it should be remembered, on any monarch's will in the first instance: it exists by virtue of the will and free gift of Christ. He gave what he chose; and on whom he chose he conferred his favours. Man has no power over the divine appointments or the

[1] Should the reader wish to see solutions to the anti-historical statements of Jewel, about the conduct of princes in former times, I would refer him to Harding's *Confutation of Jewel's Apology*, p. 303, &c. Ed. 1565.

heavenly ordinances. If then we investigate the matter under consideration as a fact, and refer either to the pages of the New Testament or of history for information, what inference must we draw? This: that to his ministers, and not to unconsecrated laymen, Christ gave this power. He gave it not to Pilate or Herod, or Caiphas or Cæsar; he left no instructions to others to confer this power on worldly Sovereigns; but he gave it to Peter and Andrew, and James and John, and the rest of the Apostolic College, as an enduring power, which was to be perpetuated by the imposition of the hands of the episcopal order. Such is the account of the sacred record. Nor is the history of the Church less explicit. Never is this power conceded to mere monarchs, but only to Peter, and the ministerial line. "Christ (says *St. Hilary*) gave forth a voice of power, when he says to the palsied, arise and walk; when he calls Lazarus from the grave; when he says to Peter and the other Apostles—'Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth, shall be bound also in heaven.'"—*Comment. in Matt.* c. xviii, n. 7. "The exalted dignity of the priesthood (observes *St. Ephrem*) is far above our understanding, and the power of speech. Remission of sins is not given to mortals without the venerable priesthood."—*De Sacer.* t. iii, p. 2. "He that has not the right to loose," says *S. Ambrose*, "has not the right to bind. .....To the Church both are lawful; to heresy both are not lawful, for *this right has been conceded to priests alone.*" —L. i, de Pœnit. S. Ambrosii opp. t. ii, p. 392.

With the emphatic words of St. Chrysostome and of the Apostolic Constitutions, I will conclude my observations on this plain point. "Tell me not," says the illustrious

prelate of Constantinople, "tell me not of the purple, of the diadem, and the robes of gold. All these are but shadows, and more transient than spring flowers ..... Tell me not of these things; but if thou wouldst see the difference between a priest and a king, examine the measure of power conferred on each, and thou wilt see the priest placed much higher than the king. For though the kingly throne seems to us glorious, from the precious stones set in it, and the gold that circles it, yet it is the king's part to administer the things of this earth, *and beyond this he has no authority whatever;* whereas the priestly throne is placed in heaven, and to it has been committed the rule over the things *that are there.* Who declares this? Even the king of heaven himself: for whatsoever, says he, you shall bind on earth, shall be bound also in heaven, and whatsoever you shall loose on earth, shall be loosed also in heaven."—*Tom.* vi, *hom.* v, *in verba,* "*vidi Dominum.*" "They," he observes in another work, "they who rule on earth have indeed also power to bind, but the body only; whereas this bond touches the soul itself and reaches unto heaven; and what the priests shall do below, the same does God ratify above." —*Lib.* iii, *de Sacerd. n.* 5. The statement made in the Apostolical Constitutions is equally clear. "Wherefore, O Bishop, be careful to be pure in deeds, knowing thy place and dignity, as bearing the type of God amongst men: *ruling over all men,* whether priests, KINGS, rulers, fathers, sons, doctors, as also over all subjects. And so sit in the Church, when thou announcest the word, as having authority to judge those who have sinned, because to you, *Bishops,* it was said: whatsoever ye shall bind on earth,

shall be bound in heaven, &c. Judge therefore, O Bishop, with authority, as God, yet receive the penitent; for God is a God of mercy."—*Apostol. Constit.* l. ii, c. xi, xii.

Another point of spiritual jurisdiction is this: "to feed and rule the flock," and instruct the people in all the truths which Christ has been pleased to reveal to his Apostles. Now to whom did Christ commit this power? To whom did he say feed, rule, teach? Not, indeed, to an earthly sovereign were these words uttered, but to Peter singly, or to the Apostles collectively. To his ministers, and his ministers only, was the commission given. They were to confront tyrants, to oppose and overcome them; to yield to these in matters connected with the ministry was absolutely inhibited. So far from the sacred writings allowing women to teach, they bid them hold their peace; and further declare that it is shameful for females to speak in the Church. Thus might I extend this matter indefinitely, in respect to the administration of the sacraments, the regulation of church matters, &c. but what I have said must suffice. It is plain that lay sovereigns have no spiritual jurisdiction. Kings may govern in temporal matters, they may, they ought to see that the affairs of their states are well regulated, for the honor of religion and the good of society; this is their kingdom: but to govern the kingdom of Christ, to rule it as a Church, this is out of their province, with this they have no direct concern. Christ regulated otherwise for his Church. Himself poor, scoffed at, insulted, crucified by royalty, he did not choose to make kings the rulers of his Church, or appoint them to regulate its concerns, and confer jurisdiction on others. He chose fishermen; and these selected and ordained and conferred

power on others whom they considered worthy of the ministry.

Nor will he form a very high estimate of the origin of the royal supremacy, who remembers that if a vacillating parliament decreed at one period this important article of faith, it altered it at another; as indeed it altered every other enactment which it had promulgated in reference to religion. The framers and passers of the act abandoned as we have already stated, not only the royal claim to supremacy, but also their right to concede it; and on bended knees petitioned the newly appointed Metropolitan and Papal Nuncio to absolve them from the crimes of which they had been guilty, by becoming the fautors of heresy and the promoters of schism.

Henry the Eighth, then, merely *usurped* the spiritual power—a power which, as the laws of our country prove, had previously been claimed and exercised by the Roman Pontiff. He assumed this authority to the exclusion of the Pontiff, for an end, and that end was the divorce of Catherine, to be succeeded by the marriage of Boleyn. He was helped in his task by others as unscrupulous as himself; and it must have amazed the royal theologian, to learn from his Parliament that his was a divine authority, that *the Holy Scripture evidently pointed to him and his, and the heirs of the English throne, as the Spiritual Heads of the Church of England!* But the Parliament meant only to compliment or please the king; it did not then use measured phrases; for it was accustomed in one session to ascribe to the Holy Spirit that which in another session it altered, modified, or altogether suppressed. In Mary's time, the royal prerogative was confined within orthodox limits, and in this the Parliament seemed cordially to

acquiesce; but in Elizabeth's reign the Supremacy was extended as much as it had previously been in the times of her father and brother; though even then, the legislature gave unqualified proofs of its subserviency. Elizabeth could not endure, as we have already been informed by Jewel, the title of *Head* of the Church. She thought that it involved a prerogative which belonged exclusively to the Saviour; and hence it happened that not by the name of *Head,* but of *Governor of the Church,* she wished to be designated in her spiritual capacity. The vacillating Parliament dared not resist the royal pleasure. The Sovereign was no longer the *Head,* she was the *Governor* of the Church; and this she was by virtue of an Act of Parliament. Whence, the thoughtful reader will ask, whence did the Parliament of England derive its authority thus to legislate! Contrast the Pontiff's rights with those of the Parliament, or the truthfulness of the Church with the varying and discreditable statements of the Reformers, and say which of the two must every sensible man receive and reverence? Compare the contempt exhibited from the very commencement of the Reformation for all authority—for the authority of the Church either dispersed over the world or gathered together in council—with the adherence and attachment of the members of the olden creed to everything venerable and ancient, and say whether the abettors of novelty, or the strenuous advocates of Catholicity, are the most deserving of attention and respectful obedience? Or, in fine, study the characters of the principal agents employed in the avulsion of England from Rome, and the establishment of a royal in lieu of a priestly domination, and ask if it be possible for any one to desecrate the name of religion,

by applying it to a system characterized by novelty, irreverence, disobedience, contempt, vacillation and moral degradation? The promoters of the Reformation were, as Macauley observes, "a king, whose character may be described by saying, that he was despotism itself personified; unprincipled ministers; a rapacious aristocracy; a servile parliament. The work which had been begun by Henry, the murderer of his wives, was continued by Somerset, the murderer of his brother; and completed by Elizabeth, the murderer of her guest. Sprung from brutal passion, nurtured by selfish policy,—the Reformation in England, displayed little of what had, in other countries, distinguished it—unflinching and unsparing devotion, boldness of speech, and singleness of eye."[1] Whilst the Pontiff ruled, unity of faith prevailed; or if ever any proud or demoralized individuals assumed the character of reformers, there was a standard by which their assertions were to be judged, and an authority whose decision was absolute for the confutation and removal of the error; but afterwards all this was sadly altered: anarchy prevailed, and error of every conflicting kind was palmed upon the Almighty. England began to be, what she now is, a Babel, where no one understood his brother when speaking of religion.

Shrewd, sensible men, in matters of worldly policy, are to be seen joining the ranks and advocating the principles of Hall and Southcoat, of Wesley and Swedenborgh, of Penn and Socinus, of Joe Smith and of every other individual who has dared to rise up and accuse a world, and call himself the heaven-sent messenger. The title-deeds

[1] See Review of Hallam's Constitutional History. *Edinburgh Review*, No. 88.

of the claimant to the throne, or dukedom, or estate, would be nicely and patiently scrutinized; so keenly would every thing be sifted, so cautiously would pedigrees be traced, so accurately would every word and fact, and shadow of a word or fact be examined, that the rightful heir would be nearly sure—to the exclusion of all pretenders—to be reinstated in his family possessions. But, in matters of religion, where eternal interests are at stake, little or no attention is paid to the evidences of religion. The pretender is received, and the one heir is rejected. The Church is treated ignominiously, and, if human efforts could have effected it, it would long ago have been destroyed. For example, when Henry claimed to be head, or Elizabeth the governor of the Church,; when both stated that the Pontiff of Rome had no right to rule the Church here, what must have been the verdict passed upon the English sovereigns, had their claims been fairly and dispassionately weighed? Why, theirs had been a hopeless cause; the Judge would have shewn that there was not a particle of evidence in favor of the new claim; he would, as Henry himself had done, have clearly proved that the Pontiff had ruled here, as well as elsewhere, from the earliest period of the conversion of this country, and that *his* claim was established by the word of God, as well as by the testification of a consentient world.

The Sovereign of this land not having any spiritual jurisdiction, what becomes of the Anglican Church, which hangs on this very doctrine. If the Sovereign has no jurisdiction, by what authority do the Archbishops, Bishops, and other Ministers act? I speak not about their character; I ask not about their orders; but I ask about the *Mission* of these Superintendents of Anglicanism. I

ask *who sent them, in the days of Henry and Elizabeth, who sends them now to preach, to administer sacraments?* Orders are requisite for an Episcopal Church, but Orders are not enough. Something beyond this is obviously requisite, as may be made clear to the mind of any reader. Put the case that Anglican bishops, or Anglican clergymen left the Establishment, to join the ranks of Hall or of the Mormonites, would this fact, the indisputable reality of ordination, be a certain proof that these defaulters from Anglicanism had a mission to teach the doctrines of Mormon, or Hall, and jurisdiction over the newly established Churches or sects, or whatever else men may be pleased in courtesy to call these human and modern institutions? Undoubtedly not, it will be answered. When ordained by Anglican prelates, and empowered to act by their ordainers, theirs was the power to administer sacraments according to the Liturgy of England, and theirs the mission to preach conformably to the doctrinal decisions contained in the Creeds, Articles, Homilies, and Liturgies: this power and mission they received, but none other. To make, if possible, this important matter still clearer: when Christ said to his Apostles, "Go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," he gave them, what is called emphatically, *mission;* he entrusted to the Apostles the important task of administering sacraments, and enunciating those truths which he himself had uttered. This was their mission. What if the Apostles had corrupted the form and altered the matter prescribed for the administration of Baptism? what if, instead of preaching Christ and his law, they had taught the Arian, or Eutychian, or Nestorian tenets about our Lord, or with Vigilantius, and

Donatus, and Manes, had advocated a system entirely opposed to that which they had received? Could the mission of Christ have been fairly alluded to, by the faithless preachers, in justification of their perverse teachings? No: they had a command from Christ to baptize and to preach, but to baptize and to preach essentially in accordance with his ordinance; and to act in opposition to this, was to oppose Christ, abandon their duties, and repudiate all title to the character of heaven-sent *missioners*. Let this reasoning be applied to the reformers. Those who were the first to undertake the duties of the ministry, had been ordained according to the Catholic ordinal, for the duties of the Catholic priesthood; to offer up the sacrifice, to administer seven sacraments, to pray for the living and the dead, to invoke the saints, to uphold the authority and primacy of the Holy See, and teach the doctrines which had been defined and taught by the Catholic Church. For these ends they were sent forth as missioners; but when they apostatized, did this mission last? Orders were indeed perpetuated—for the sacramental character of the priesthood is indelible—but the mission on which they had been sent, did that endure? Obviously not: for then they were sent forth, not to uphold, but to oppose the Popedom, and teach according to the humour of the Parliament or the will of the Sovereign, doctrines diametrically opposed to those in which the Catholic Church, the Church of their ordination, believed. They were even taught that the Church of their ordination was an apostate, an infidel Church. Whence, I ask, had these men, and those who succeeded them, their mission? From Rome? No: Rome's mission was of a directly opposite character. From the Parliament,

from the Queen, the King? But whence had they, only members by baptism of an apostate Church! this power? These sent forth the new race of teachers and ministers; yes: but what right had they, and what power to give the commission? Whence had they, more than the missioners themselves, the *right*, the power to issue the ordinances they did? The *apostolical mission*, proveable by the union of the ministers, in Catholic times, with the unceasing authority of the Holy See,—that Holy See through which Augustine, and Pacian, and the other fathers, proved their mission and their Catholicity—was stopped by the royal order, when that order was obeyed. Whence, then, did the ministers of a new creed derive their mission? They received it from Henry, or Edward, or Elizabeth, even as Wesleyans, and Hallites, and Mormonites received theirs from Wesley, and Hall, and Smith. These were commissioned by as good, as available, and as proveable an authority, to preach a different doctrine from Protestantism, as were the early apostates from Catholicity to oppose the Pontiff. Apostolical mission is wanting, is utterly destroyed and ignored, in point of fact, in the Establishment. And hence, again, on this very account, the nullity of Anglicanism is rendered apparent; for the Church of Christ was ever to have a *divine* mission, a mission which, commencing with the Apostles, was to endure to the end of time. It does endure, plainly, manifestly; it endures in the Church of the Popedom. The successor of blessed Peter, through his prelates and pastors, rules the world: these have their orders and their mission, as well as their faith, from men commissioned and lawfully empowered by the Holy See, to preach, to teach,

and administer every ordinance of religion. "I am united to your blessedness, that is, to the See of Peter, to whom Christ said, 'feed my lambs,' 'feed my sheep,'" is the cheering cry of every Catholic minister now, as it was in the days of Jerome and Augustine. But out of this Church there is no such mission. The Apostolical line has been broken elsewhere by heresy, the line of preachers is new; it may ascend as high as some king-reformer, or some other, who notoriously rebelled against, and left the Church of his ordination, but there it stops; and there a line begins, new, and isolated, and unknown as an authority, to the rest of Christendom. The Church of the new preachers may be be a regal Establishment, it may have the authority of a parliament for its existence; but that is its highest honor, and this is its creation. The Establishment being essentially English, it may be called the English Church: but what becomes of the Church of our common creed? What is the meaning of the words "*I believe in the holy Catholic Church,*" when repeated by an Anglican?

What did religion gain by the removal of a Pope, and the substitution of a King for the spiritual head? Unity of faith? That has disappeared. Freedom from the state? She has become its slave. The power of enforcing discipline? That has been taken out of her hands. The appointment of her own ministers? No, no: ministers of state appoint these. I speak of a fact; I care not how this fact may be explained in words; but the state does appoint the episcopal order; and though the clergy, even with a dean at their head, may denounce the bishop elect as *an infidel,* still the bishop elect will soon become the

consecrated prelate, and in his hands will be placed the reins of spiritual power, together with the riches of the see.[1] Has virtue been promoted? No: even the Anglican bishops are forced to regret the heathenism and demoralization of these days. Has a knowledge of the Bible at least been the result? Again I answer no. See the crowds who follow dissent in a thousand contradictory forms, and my answer is at once justified. Attend to the reports relative to the state of knowledge in our towns, and what shall you find? That there are numbers who know not who Christ is—many, who hardly know even if there be a God. And has England left herself a chance of becoming Catholic, and of ceasing to be an object of pity to the nations of the world, on account of her separatism? No: the Dutchman's act justifies rebellion, in case an English monarch shall dare to belong to the Church of the Alfreds, and Edwards, and Richards, who formerly held the English sceptre. Since that day,

On Christmas night no Mass is sung;

the Mass has been proscribed. Since the Reformation, no more do we hear that knell

> Which they were wont to toll
> For welfare of a parted soul;

for prayers for the dead, if not illegal, are not consistent with Protestant ideas. Anglicans will not be helped by the prayers of the faithful, or believe in a middle state of

[1] Let the reader bear in mind what occurred on the appointment of Dr. Hampden to the See of Hereford.

souls; but, with the profane Skelton, tutor to Henry VIII, they say,

> "I will no priestis for me sing—Dies iræ, dies illa," &c.

No more

> Merry sing the monks of Ely
> When .... the king is passing by;

The monasteries, still glorious, even in their present ruined condition, are the receptacles of lowing cattle and birds of night: God's praises may no more be celebrated there. Angel guardians have been banished; the "communion of saints" is no longer enjoyed; a table has taken the place of the altar; and Christ, having left his temple, it seems to be under an interdict. Men no longer walk on a rock,—on the *soliditas cathedræ Petri*, but on a quicksand: here to-day, there to-morrow. Poor England! If some men will prefer the barley-corn to the gem; the teachings of *Wart*, *Slender*, *Mouldy*, and *Shallow*, to the teachings of the *Leos*, *Gregories*, and *Piuses*, who shall envy their choice? To us, who have the happiness of being Catholics, be it given to remain to the end, united to Peter's See, that see which made England Catholic, and further, which made it *one*, and holy, and happy.

Chapter the Seventh.

On the Anglican Authorized Bible.

CONTENTS.

Heretics, both ancient and modern, adopt some distinctive version of the Scriptures.—Necessity of this; and consequent recriminations.—Translations formerly approved of, but condemned by Henry VIII.—Elizabeth's Bibles denounced.—The Authorized version of 1611.—History of this version.—The Translators, and the rules which they were obliged by James to follow.—No correct Anglican Bible till seventy-seven years after the Reformation.—Consequences to be drawn from this admission, fatal to the Reformation.—The Authorized Version has been and is complained of by the learned.—Proofs.—Lowth has shaken to pieces the very foundations on which the translation of the Old Testament was based.—Obvious difficulties in connection with the translation of the New Testament.—Development of the principles of this difficulty.—Labours of Mills and others to recover the true Apostolic text.—Proofs given in detail of the ignorance and unfitness of the English translators.

At all times, the various sects which have divided the Church have had recourse to new translations of the Sacred Scriptures. Marcion, as Tertullian informs us, rejected the version made use of by the first apologist of Christianity; the Arians adopted an edition of the Scriptures which was emphatically their own; and so it was with the other sects which appeared age after age. What then happened has particularly characterized the heresies

of the sixteenth and following centuries. Beza, and Castalio, and Luther and Calvin, as well as the English reformers, all heaven-sent, if their words are worthy of credit, deemed it wise, if not absolutely necessary, to issue fresh translations of the Sacred Scriptures, when engaged in the task of teaching new systems and new creeds. Innovations of the Bible kept pace with innovations of faith: the Bible was to be reformed when the Reformation was to be spread. This was obviously natural. As might be expected, the Bible of one party met with opposition from the defenders of another Bible and another creed. If Beza condemned the translation of Œcolampadius, Castalio condemned Beza's version, and Molinœus condemned Castalio's. Luther censured Munzer, and Zwingli Luther, for having mistranslated the sacred text. Nor have the English translators escaped censure. Notwithstanding the praise originally given by the Anglican reformers to the translation made by Tyndal, it was enacted by the authority of Parliament in 1543—"that all manner of books of the Old and New Testament, of the *crafty, false, and untrue translation of Tyndal,* be forthwith abolished, and forbidden to be used and kept: and also, *that all other Bibles,* not being of Tyndal's translation, in which were found any preambles or annotations, other than the quotations or summary of the chapters, should be purged of the said preambles or annotations, either by cutting them out, or blotting them in such wise that they might not be perceived or read; and finally, that *the Bible be not read openly in any Church, but by leave of the King, or of the ordinary of the place; nor privately by any women, artificers, apprentices, journeymen, husbandmen, labourers, or by any of the servants of yeo-*

men, or under." [1] Nor was the great Anglican Reformer even content with this. It is stated by Pretyman, that in the last year of his reign, Henry "issued a proclamation, prohibiting the having and reading Wycliffe's, Tyndal's, and Coverdale's translations, and forbidding the "use of any other not allowed by Parliament." [2] Numerous editions were issued of the Geneva and Bishop's Bible, during the reign of Elizabeth; but with these the prelates and ministers of the times of James I, were as little satisfied as former ministers had been with Tyndal's, and Coverdale's, and Wycliffe's biblical labours. Some of the ministers of the diocese of Lincoln, denounced the translations as sometimes "absurd and senseless, perverting in many places the meaning of the Holy Ghost." And Broughton, in his advertisements relative to the corruptions of the Bible, tells the Bishops, that "their public translation of the Scriptures into English is such, that it perverts the text of the Old Testament, in eight hundred and forty places, and causes millions of millions to reject the New Testament, and run to eternal flames." The result of these and similar observations was, a new translation, which appeared in the year 1611, which was then appointed what it has ever since been considered to be, *the Authorized Version* of the English Church. The Royal Monarch himself drew up the rules according to which the translation was to be made, and the under-

[1] St. 34 Henry VIII, 1; see also Pretyman, vol. ii, p. 12, Ed. 1799, and Burnet, vol. i, p. 321.

[2] Pretyman, vol. ii, p. 13. I suspect, however, that this writer confounds the King's Speech with a Proclamation. See the Speech in Hall, 160, and Burnet, p. 338.

taking was entrusted to forty-seven individuals of whom Bancroft was "*the chief overseer and taskmaster.*"[1]

The translators were far from being distinguished, as a body, by talent or erudition: assuredly they were little fitted to instruct a world, either in the meaning of the sacred word, or the real character of those inspired writings, which they unhesitatingly cast out of the Canon of the Scriptures, notwithstanding the opposition of nearly the whole of Christendom, and denounced as uninspired and apochryphal. They were men too whose religious opinions were already fixed. They were members of a Church which, though it disclaimed, and with reason, all infallibility, bound down all its followers to a certain code of belief. They were believers in the Thirty-nine Articles; and he must be indeed ignorant of the influence of preconceived opinions, who can for a moment suppose that such belief would not materially influence the translators in the work in which they were engaged, and induce them to attach a meaning to every doubtful text, according rather with their own than with the belief of a rival Church. Thus fallible Protestantism would direct the infallible word of God, and the inspired writings would be subjected to the influences of the framers of the Anglican profession of faith. Every person will at once see the extent of these educational or doctrinal prejudices in the version of the Socinian or Unitarian. Texts demonstrative of the Divinity of the Son are rendered absolutely nugatory; the divine evidence being at once obscured, or entirely annulled, by the change of a stop, or by references to some transcribers

[1] Pretyman, vol. ii, p. 17.

who have substituted one word for another, or added a single letter to the text. And were Anglicans, under the guidance of the wisest fool of Europe,[2] and the direction of the greatest sycophant of the age,[3] less liable to an internal or external bias, than the more modern sectarian? We imagine not.

From what has been said, it is obvious that there was not, till the year 1611, any correct or *authorized* copy of the Sacred Scriptures in the Anglican Establishment. If Protestants will rely on Protestant testimony, they must believe that the works circulated under the name of the *word of God,* were no better than corrupt translations of the original text, and so far from meriting approbation, they deserved to be condemned, and eventually suppressed. Neither Wycliffe's, nor Tyndal's, nor Coverdale's, nor Roger's, nor any other person's version sufficed; they were all condemned as grossly faulty. What follows from this? A truth deserving of the most attentive consideration of Anglicans, and the truth is this: *from a corrupt source, Anglicans were, in the first instance, called upon to derive their faith.* They were told to learn the faith from the Scriptures then circulated, and those Scriptures needed themselves a reformation. No one then can feel surprise either at the errors of the Establishment, or at the necessity in which numbers found themselves, of reforming the Reformation, and thus opening wide the gates of dissent.

But was this edition calculated to satisfy the wants

[2] Thus was James designated by the Duc de Sully.

[3] Bancroft referring to the conduct of James at Hampton Court, said that "his heart melted within him to hear a king, *the like of whom had not been seen since the time of Christ!*"

of the people? No. Soon, it too was denounced; and year after year we find men like Archbishop Newcome, Symonds, Wakefield and Blackwall, suggesting important alterations, and publishing what to them appeared more correct and amended editions of the written word. "A new translation (says Blackwall) can give no offence to people of sound judgment and consideration; because everybody conversant in these, and unprejudiced, must acknowledge that there was less occasion to change the old version into the present, than to change the present into a new one. Any scholar that compares them will find that the old one, though amended by this that we now use, in several places, is yet equal to it in very many, and superior in a considerable number."[1] Let the reader take up any one of the numerous private editions of the Sacred Scriptures, whether published by members of the Anglican Church, or of the Unitarian, Wesleyan, or Independent sections of dissent; let him consult any or all of the commentaries which have appeared,—and these works abound in every part of the land,—and he will find all agreeing in one thing: that the Anglican version published in 1611, and authorized by James I, is far from being a fair representation of the written word, though ignorant people are taught to believe that it is wholly and entirely God's word, and of such authority that from it may be fully and readily gathered the system of faith and code of morality which immediately emanated from the Almighty during the period of the old law, and at and after the establishment of the new by our divine Redeemer.

Indeed, has not the illustrious and learned Oxford

[1] Vol. ii, præf. xxii.

professor, Lowth, shaken to pieces the biblical fabric which Bancroft and his collaborateurs had raised up? These men, as every biblical scholar knows, closely adhered to the interpretation of the Old Testament adopted by the Masorites. Now what is the opinion of Lowth, who is admittedly one of the ablest scholars Protestantism can boast of, of this system of interpretation? Why, he denounces it *as erroneous and deceptive.* "Their infallible Masora (he says) boasted to have been an edifice raised by wise master builders on the rock of divine authority, proves to have been framed by unskilful hands, and built on sand; its foundation has been shaken, and it now totters to its fall." [2]

And might not the difficulty be extended? Might not and will not every scholar ask, what copy of the New Testament was made use of by the translators. That no sacred writer either drew up two differently worded accounts of our Saviour's actions, or penned varying copies of the sacred Epistles, is universally admitted; and yet it is a fact, that though there was but one original, one type, there are numerous copies differing considerably one from the other. For the sake of convenience, these variations have been reduced to certain classes and families; to the

[2] See Moore, vol. ii, 325.

Johnson observes that "our English translators took the present Hebrew text as it is printed by the Masorites to be the only sense and meaning of the Old Testament." He shows how this text entirely annuls the famous prophecy of Daniel ix, 25, by the insertion of an athnach, or semicolon, after "*threescore and two weeks.*" See too *Rees' Cyclop. Art. Masora. Simon* also, in his History of the English Version, sadly deplores the use of the Masora. See *English Trans.*

Alexandrine and Constantinopolitan, if Griesbach's division be adopted; or, if the reader prefer the division of Hug, to the common Greek Vulgate, and to the editions of Hesychius, Lucian, and Origen. Now which of these copies represents *the* original? That all do not is obvious; but does any one fairly represent the word as it first was penned by the inspired writers? If any one does, which is it? And was this *the* copy which lay before the English translators of the version authorized by the English Sovereign in 1611.

The various translations of the New Testament, which were circulated at a very early period through the Church, prove that all had not the same copy. The *Vetus Itala*, differs from the Peschito and ancient Syriac versions; and these again, from the translations made use of in Armenia, Arabia, and Æthiopia. What copy did each translator follow; and which, I again ask, had the correct edition? Since a word, a clause, an interrogation, may make a material alteration in the text, it is of the utmost importance to discover which copy was exactly conformable with the divine original. To apply these observations: are the first chapters of St. Matthew's gospel really a portion of the inspired writings; is the account of the adulterous woman, which occurs in John viii, 1, 11, of the Anglican version, authentic; or, to give another instance, is the far-famed passage, relative to the three heavenly witnesses, which occurs in chap. v, 7, of St. John's first epistle, a forgery, an addition to the sacred text, or is it really the original declaration of the *beloved disciple?* Some copies have appeared without these passages, whilst others contain them; which copies are correct? The Apostolic and

other inspired originals, have long ago perished; in these instances then, of conflicting editions, what guide did the English translators follow? Why were those copies adhered to, which contained, rather than those which rejected the passages already named? The Church was rejected; it had failed, it was said; it had corrupted the revelations of the Almighty; it had failed everywhere; the whole world had abandoned the truth, and yielded to damnable idolatry; how could the evidence of such a world be received? It could, in the Protestant hypothesis, everywhere corrupt and reject the truth; could it not as easily corrupt and reject, take from and add to, the written word? At all events, diversity did exist—this fact is patent—relative to the *letter* of Holy Writ; what principle was adopted, or what guide was followed to fix, and with certainty too, upon the particular edition of the many in circulation, from which the English translation was to be derived, to represent the pure word of God? Criticism, at that period, was hardly known in England; manuscripts were not compared, nor were any extraordinary efforts made to obtain a certainly pure and authorized text. *Translation* was the task of the forty-seven, and not the critical examination either of ancient written or printed copies of the text of the New Testament.

Thus, the text of the Old Testament, adopted by the forty-seven, is found to be inadmissible, if learned Protestants can be relied on; and that of the New cannot be proved in such a manner, as to convince anyone, on Protestant grounds, that he really reads the Inspired Volume, when he peruses the authorized version of the Church of England.

What pains have been taken since the publication of

James' Bible, to recover the original text of the New Testament, is generally known. The names of Mills, and Bentley, and Kennicot, and Hug, and Scholz, will be sufficient to recal to the mind of the reader, the fatigue endured, and expenses incurred, in the arduous undertaking, by some of the greatest scholars and critics of the day. It was found that the wording of the sacred text was in a more lamentable state than the text of any profane author. Mills reckoned his *variantia* by tens of thousands, and Bentley, notwithstanding his endeavours to reduce the number, was forced to allow, that in his edition, there would be "near six thousand variations, great and little, from the received Greek and Latin examples." Bentley lived till the year 1742; so that if a correct copy of the Bible was ever in a Protestant hand, it was not a copy "authorized by James I." But is the text even now settled? It must be fixed, before a Protestant can even fancy that he has a creed. His creed depends upon the text, if his rule of faith be admitted to be true. But he must be indeed able to hope against hope, who can suppose that a comparatively modern application of the rules of criticism to the text of the Bible, has already been brought to perfection; and that our modern investigators have been so successful in their search, as to have fallen upon the most ancient and correct manuscripts of the sacred text at once. May not other Bentleys, Hugs, Scholz, and Rosenmullers arise; and may not the world eventually possess some persevering and inventive decipherer of Biblical palimpsests, equal in ingenuity and zeal to the illustrious Cardinal Mai, who has discovered the lost works of many a Pagan, Jewish, and Christian writer?

In order to shew the *defectiveness* of the authorized Anglican translation, I will draw the reader's attention to a few passages which have been so clearly mistranslated, that every scholar will at once see, that the forty-seven translators were ignorant of the fundamental principles of the Greek language.

2 Cor. iii, 17, ὁ δὲ Κύριος τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν. If there be six plain Greek words, these six words are they. But how are they translated? "Now the Lord is *that* spirit." The pronoun is substituted ignorantly for the article, and this substitution renders the meaning unintelligible. "I am utterly at a loss," says Professor Scholefield, "to imagine what sense our translators meant to attach to the passage, in adopting the strange and inaccurate rendering, *that* spirit." He again observes, that, "so free, unhappily, did our translators make with the article, that they scrupled not at either its insertion or omission." This observation is most just, and it is as important as it is just: for by this insertion or omission the text is often materially affected. In illustration of this, I will adduce a passage from St. Peter's second Epistle, i, 1. The words, ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, are thus translated: "through the righteousness of God and our Saviour Jesus Christ." This translation misrepresents the text; for the Greek words clearly mean "*our God and Saviour*," and are invaluable as a proof of the divinity of Jesus Christ. In the Protestant translation the proof is destroyed; it is impossible to convince any person from it, that Christ has any title to divinity.

In the following passage of St. Matthew, xx, 23: οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸν δοῦναι, ἀλλ' οἷς ἡτοίμασται ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός μου, which is thus translated, "is not mine to give but *it shall be*

given to them for whom it is prepared of my Father," the professor already referred to, finds, and with reason, very much to blame. "By foisting in," he says, "the supernumerary words, we make the passage contain a doctrine directly contrary to other places of Scripture, *e.g.*, John xvii, 2, Revelations iii, 21. Precisely the same expression, ἀλλ' οἷς, occurs above in chapter xix, 2, where it is properly translated *save*. So also in 2 Corinthians, ii, 5, ἀλλ ἀπὸ μέρους." It is vain to adduce the authority of the Vulgate for the authorized translation; vain too to retort by pointing out defects in Catholic translations, whether authorized or unauthorized: for the Bible alone is not our rule of faith; *we* do not believe that it is requisite to read or to hear the text of the *written word*, to learn what are the revelations of the Almighty. Protestants read to have faith; we read already having our faith fixed and determined.

But there are other errors of a more serious character still. A modern Protestant writer has observed, that the words, "search the Scriptures (St. John v, 39.)," have undone the world. Now is there such a command in the New Testament, as seems to be implied in the passage cited? Are the words, ἐρευνᾶτε τὰς γραφὰς, indicative or imperative? The best Protestant scholars of more modern times, as Bishop Jebb,[1] Le Clerc, Lenfant,[2] Clarke,[3] Elsler, &c.[4] agree in maintaining that the words are indicative and not imperative; and indeed, the whole context seems to them, as to me, to require this explanation. Our Lord

[1] Practical Theology, vol. i, pp. 287, 292.

[2] In l. c. Vous examinez, &c. Such is his reading of the text; of course he alludes to the other reading in the *note*.

[3] Clarke in loco.

[4] In l. vol. iii, p. 53.

states a fact, and the cause of the fact; but he still demands obedience to his words; those words being a divine testification, such as none would be excused for rejecting, whatever inferences they might draw from a private perusal of the sacred text. What inferences they did draw, we know. Stand they excused, for condemning Christ to death, in consequence of their inferences? But excused they would be, if they had been thrown upon their own deductions by Jesus Christ, and had been referred to the Scriptures as *the* authority whence alone their knowledge of the Messias was to be derived.

Passing over passages like these, which reflect little credit on the knowledge or criticism of the translators, I will now draw the reader's attention to errors of a graver character; errors which can only be fairly ascribed to a bias of the mind, resultant from the adoption of a distinctive system of religious belief; in consequence of which, the writers, as Dryden has well observed, "rule the Scriptures, not the Scriptures them."

In answer to a question proposed by the Apostles relative to virginity, our Saviour thus replied: Οὐ πάντες χωροῦσι τὸν λόγον τοῦτον, ἀλλ' οἷς δεδοται. (Matt, xix, 11.) These words are thus translated in the authorized version: "all men *cannot* receive this saying, &c." This corruption is as manifest as it is shameless: the obvious and only meaning being: "all men do not take this word," not *cannot* take. And mark this: when in the following verse, the same verb χωρέιτω occurs, it *is* translated in reference to the act, and not as before, in reference to the power: "*Let him receive*," the translators say, and not "let him *be able* to receive."

For a similar object—this object was to inhibit celibacy, and defend the marriage of *all* persons, even of those who like the first reformers had vowed a life of celibacy—the text of St. Paul (Hebrews xiii, 4, 5)—*τίμιος ὁ γάμος ἐν πᾶσι, καὶ ἡ κοίτη ἀμίαντος. . . . ἀΦιλάργυρος ὁ τρόπος*—was thus corrupted: "Marriage *is* honourable in all, and the bed undefiled. . . . . *let your conversation be* without covetousness." If *τίμιος ὁ γάμος* means, marriage *is* honorable, then *ἀΦιλάργυρος ὁ τρόπος*, likewise means, your conversation *is* without covetousness. The construction is the same; the nature of the declaration is the same. But the absurdity of rendering the latter period declarative, was obvious: equally obvious too, to every unprejudiced mind, must be the folly of making the first words of the Apostle declarative. The sentence is, as the whole argument proves, simply hortatory. St. Paul wishes that marriage *may* be honorable in all things—that the bed *may* be undefiled, &c. And this idea he eloquently enforces. Take the words as they stand in the authorized translation, and the passage becomes an absurdity. If marriage be honorable in all, then it is honorable in near relations, in persons of ages widely and shamefully different, in those whom natural and positive laws proclaim unfit for the marriage state; not to refer to a variety of other examples equally subversive of the Protestant interpretation, and of the whole scope of St. Paul's doctrinal statements on the point of matrimony.[1]

Again, who has not heard denunciations of the use of the Latin tongue in the Liturgy, on the ground of its being an *unknown* tongue, and as such condemned by

[1] See 1 Tim. v, 9, et seqq.

St. Paul in 1 Cor. xiv. In that chapter of the English translation, the awful words, *unknown tongues*, occur no fewer than five times; and if Latin was indeed considered by the Apostle as one of the unknown tongues, and his address regarded prayers recited under circumstances similar to those which characterize the liturgical addresses of the Catholic Church, certainly the Protestant might appeal with confidence to the chapter of the English Bible just referred to. But unfortunately for Protestantism, St. Paul neither speaks of Latin, nor of any liturgical observances, nor does he once make use of the words unknown tongues: he refers to the gift of the Holy Spirit, which God was pleased to communicate to the faithful at the beginning of the Church, in further testification of the truth of Christianity, the gift of speaking a language not humanly learned, but divinely received; and makes regulations in reference to this gift. But mark this observation: though the word *γλώσσα*, tongue, is throughout the entire chapter unencumbered by any adjective, it is at one time rendered simply by the word, tongue, and at other times, by the words, *unknown* tongues: see verses 4, 13, 14, 19, 27. Of the folly of this addition in some instances, the reader will be fully convinced who attends to the reading of the 27th verse in the authorized version: St. Paul ordains that some one should interpret the *unknown* tongue: a difficult task, assuredly, for any interpreter!

Nor is the translation of the words, *ὥστε ὃς ἂν ἐσθίῃ τὸν ἄρτὸν τοῦτον, ἢ πίνῃ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦ κυρίου ἀναξίως*, &c. (1 Cor. xi, 27), less culpable than the preceding instances of ignorance or deceit. The disjunctive *ἢ*, *or*, is rendered by the conjunctive *and;* and thus a material alteration

is introduced into the text, an alteration of which the Protestant party has taken no little advantage.[1] This translation was made to buttress up the Anglican doctrine of communion under two kinds. The reader shall now see what was done by the same truthful expounders of the Greek text, in favour of the doctrine, not of the real presence, but of the real absence of the body of Jesus Christ in the holy mystery: and though the variation may at first sight appear truly small, it will be soon seen not to be unimportant. In the xxvi, 26, of St. Matthew, the xiv, 22, of St. Mark, and the xxii, 19, of St. Luke, of the Protestant version, occurs the small pronoun *it*, a word of obvious importance in its relation with other words. From the English text it would plainly appear, that our Divine Saviour gave his Apostles nothing but *bread* at the Last Supper; the *it* obviously connotating the bread which our Saviour had previously taken into his hands. The translation is as follows: "And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed *it*, and brake *it*, and gave *it* to his disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body."

[1] Such is the reading in the received, printed, and critical editions of the Greek Testament: the disjunctive ἤ, not the conjunctive καί, being uniformly approved of; and that such was the reading in the edition used by the translators in James' reign, is unquestionable. It is foolish then to state, in justification of the mistranslation, that in some MSS. and printed readings of this passage, καί occurs, and not ἤ; for we are not examining the value of this or that reading, but the value of the English translation. Does ἤ signify *or*, or does it not? Is this the ordinary, received meaning of the word; and have the Anglican translators elsewhere translated it as a disjunctive participle? If the answer be in the affirmative, then it is clear that ἤ should be here translated by *or*, and it is equally clear, that it would have been thus translated, had not the prepossession of heresy guided Bancroft and his friends in their task of translation.

Now will not the honest reader be surprised to find, that this *it* is wholly redundant. The particulars of the Last Supper are given by three of the Evangelists, and further St. Paul "received of the Lord,"[1] that which he delivered to the Corinthians relative to the sacred institution of the holy mystery. Now none of these sacred writers ever once insert this *it:* nay, more, they studiously avoid its insertion; leaving the decision of the nature of the gift to Christ's Almighty words which immediately follow the record of the blessing, breaking and giving. Had the Apostles wished to say that Christ blessed *it*, broke *it*, gave *it*, how easily and appropriately might they not have inserted that pronoun; by carefully avoiding its insertion, they gave their readers to understand that the omission was intended; that there was an object in omitting the word; and what that object was is clearly developed in the following words of our Lord: "*this is my body!*" By following the Apostolical example, the translators would have avoided an act of unwarrantable misrepresentation; they would have given, not a representation of their insular error, but an exposition of the divine teaching; and this only does the biblical student desiderate.

[1] 1 Cor. xi, 24.

Chapter the Eighth.

On the meaning of the word, Holy Scriptures; and on the inspiration, authenticity, and canonicity of the Bible.

CONTENTS.

Importance of this examination, and the difficulty it involves.—Meaning of the word Bible.—Origin, age, country, and character of the sacred writings.—Inspiration required.—What it is.—Protestant theories developed.—No fixed ideas on this head, though inspiration is essential to the Bible.—By extrinsic proofs only can inspiration be proved—admitted by Taylor, Hooker, &c.—Foolish proofs of inspiration adduced by Anglicans from Christ's words.—Authenticity.—The canonical writings.—The sixth Article on this head, false.—Some works admitted by Protestants, were formerly doubted of as much as those writings which they reject.—Continuous evidence on this head.—Principles advocated by Cyril and others for discovering the canonicity of any writing.—Whether Protestants reject or receive tradition, their position is untenable.—Belief of the Church at the end of the fourth century relative to the sacred books.—Lists of the Scriptures drawn up at Carthage, at Rome, and elsewhere.—Detailed and specific examination of each of the divine writings rejected by Protestants.—Their canonicity clearly established.—Falseness of the sixth Article in whatever way it be tested.—Protestants know absolutely nothing of the origin and mode of settling the canon of the Old Testament.—Varying accounts on this head, in respect to Esdras, the Synagogue, and the works forming the Bible, at various periods.—Even after Esdras, books added to the Canon.—Testimony of Josephus, and the principle involved in it.—Observations on the statement of the sixth Article in connection with St. Jerome.—The statement unfair, and disproved by St. Jerome himself.—Catholic principle advocated by this Saint.

We will now proceed to investigate the *character* and *number* of the books themselves which form the canon of the

Sacred Scriptures. This is obviously a most important subject, far more important than that on which we have been previously engaged; for it regards the book itself, the letter of inspiration. If in the settlement of the books, Protestantism has erred; if it has rejected works which emanate from God; if it has undermined the ecclesiastical fabric which it was endeavouring to upraise, by removing the foundation stone on which all depended, then indeed it will be admitted that the state of Anglicanism is truly deplorable. The sequel will shew what is the position of Anglicanism under all these points of view: it will be seen, that though "it is to the Church, authoritatively declaring what scripture is to be accepted, and what rejected, that men are indebted for the possessing of the written word, still, some exercising their assumed right of private judgment, have been disposed to pick and choose in regard to whole books and chapters of the Bible."[1] It will further be shewn, that Protestantism is wholly and entirely unable to vindicate the canon of Scripture which it receives: for the principle admitted in the sixth Article is suicidal to Protestantism, whilst the assertion "that those books only are to be admitted to be canonical of which there was never any doubt in the Church," is false in itself, and destructive of that very canon of Scripture which Anglicanism holds out to its followers as certainly divine.

To elucidate this matter, to render the biblical question plain and intelligible, I will treat the whole subject in detail. From these details alone, will the careful reader be able thoroughly to understand the meaning of the much abused words *the Bible, the Inspired Writings, the Canonical Scriptures, the Apochrypha.*

[1] See Digby's Compitum., vol. vi, 117.

1° What is the Bible? It is a collection of works written by men who were not simply assisted, but who were *inspired* by Almighty God during the composition of their *writings*. These works form two distinct volumes; one of which records facts, prophecies, and other circumstances connected with a period anterior to the coming of our Divine Redeemer: whilst the other contains a history of our Divine Saviour, and of some of his Apostles, as well as sundry Epistles, written under a great variety of circumstances, and a remarkable prophetic writing regarding the fortunes of the Church in a period of severe trial. The former volume, or the Old Bible, contains, according to the decision of the Council of Trent, forty-five books, or thirty-nine distinct treatises, whilst the latter, commonly called the New Testament, consists of twenty-seven treatises. These writings were penned by various authors, of some of whom much is certainly known, whilst of others we know absolutely nothing: by authors whose education, and talents, and birth, were widely different; some like a Moses, being trained in the palaces of kings, whilst others like an Amos, were more used to hard toil and labour than to the luxury of courts. They were written too in countries widely remote, some in Palestine, where magnificent scenery struck the eye at every turn, where plenty abounded, and where there were evidences of the special interposition of a divine Providence, which must have deeply affected the minds of the observant and of the pious; others in Greece, where pride, and luxury, and idolatry, and fondness for the wrestle and the race, prevailed; and others again in Italy, where each spot was immortalized by the valour of the soldiers of imperial Rome, and adorned by some trophy of greatness,

or some proof of the refinements and arts of civilization. Again, they were written at periods widely apart: some dating from a time coeval with the Exodus; whilst others regard events connected with the close of the first century of Christianity. The object of the Sacred writings was also very dissimilar: that of the oldest being to acquaint the Jews with the origin of the world, and its earliest history; as also with the civil and religious polity of the Hebrew theocracy: whilst others were prophecies of woes or of blessings; or songs in praise of the goodness of God; or histories full of Christ's wisdom and goodness; or records of Apostolic zeal. These writings embody a mass of miscellaneous information, such as will be sought for elsewhere in vain, expressed in language of the most unequal merit, if mere composition be considered.

These writings of such different *times*, and *countries*, and *languages*, and *subjects*, and *literary merit*, are believed to be DIVINE *writings*, GOD'S *word*, INSPIRED compositions; and on this account are preferred to all other compositions, and are called emphatically THE *books*. Men penned, but God directed the writing: they toiled and laboured as if the works on which they were engaged were simply human compositions, such writings as Josephus or Philo, Hermas or Barnabas composed; but God was in fact their guide, their special assistant, the principle of light and of inspiration, though in some instances even the sacred authors may have been unconscious of the extent of the heaven-derived assistance. Inspiration, whatever that word may mean, is of the essence of the sacred books; the writer must be inspired, if his compositions are to be entitled, Holy Scripture. It will be important to discuss the meaning of the word at the begin-

ning of this chapter which is dedicated to the discovery of the sacred writings; to the separation of the human from the divine.

The question when simply stated, is this: what interference is required on the part of God, to secure to any writing the character of Sacred Scripture. As is plain, God may variously and in various times concur towards the composition of any writing, and all these modes have been honored by the name of Inspiration. Of these ways three and three only deserve our attention; for about these only has there ever existed any real dispute among contending parties. God then may help the writer either by his revelations, or directing influence, or by way of inspiration. By revelation, I understand, the manifestation of something of which the writer was either wholly ignorant, or at all events of which he was unmindful at the time, when that particular truth was manifested by the Almighty; whilst by *direction*, I mean, that watchful providence of God, by which the writer is secured against error or mistake. Inspiration, on the other hand, signifies an interior movement of the soul proceeding from God, urging on the writer to that particular task. As is clear, inspiration and revelation may either precede or accompany the actual writing of a work. God may *reveal* to another his truth, before the individual begins to write; or he may communicate his truths only during the time of writing. The same observation is applicable to the action of God, by way of inspiration. Further, it may happen, that subsequently to the completion of any writing, God may reveal the truthfulness of that instrument, and thus give the sanction of his authority to a writing, purely human in its origin *as a writing.*

Now the question originally proposed occurs: what kind of concurrence is required to entitle a writing to be called Scripture: and in what way, as a matter of fact, has God concurred to the writing of those volumes which Jews and Christians honor as the written word of God? The first part of the question is clearly one of great importance. On it turns, in point of fact, the divinity of the sacred books; and unless this question can be distinctly answered, only words and not ideas are attended to when men speak of inspired writings.

Now, has the Protestant, as such, any fixed meaning when he speaks of the Sacred Scriptures? He has not. The word is wholly undefined; it varies under the explanations of nearly every writer, and it varies too in its application to the various books and portions of books which form the Canon of the Sacred Volume. "When it is said, that Scripture is inspired, (says Pretyman,) it is not to be understood that God suggested every word, or dictated every expression. It appears from the different styles in which the books are written, and from the different manner in which the same events are related and predicted by different authors, that the sacred penmen were permitted to write as their several tempers, understandings, and habits of life, directed; and that the knowledge communicated to them by inspiration was applied to the subject of their writings in the same manner as any knowledge acquired by ordinary means." Thus the *style* was not inspired, or even interfered with by God. Let us see whether inspiration affects FACTS, *the subject matter* of the sacred documents. "Nor is it to be supposed, (I still cite the above-named author,) that they were even thus inspired in every fact which they related, or in every

precept which they delivered. They were left to the common use of their faculties, and did not upon every occasion stand in need of supernatural communication; but whenever, and as far as divine assistance was necessary, it was always afforded. In different parts of Scripture, we perceive that there were different sorts and degrees of inspiration. God enabled Moses to give an account of the creation of the world; he enabled Josue to record with exactness the settlement of the Israelites in the land of Canaan; he enabled David to mingle prophetic information with the various effusions of gratitude, contrition and piety; he enabled Solomon to deliver wise instructions for the regulation of human life; he enabled Isaiah to deliver predictions concerning the future Saviour of mankind, and Ezra to collect the Sacred Scriptures into one authentic volume." Thus the inspiration is widely different *as to facts:* some requiring at one period or other, a direct revelation; whilst others only needed either a heavenly impulse, or a divine guidance, or the superintendence and protection of God. This only follows, I say, at the most, from the writing cited. To me it appears clear that the author has supposed much which required proof. He argues from the necessity of a revelation at some period, and to some person, to the communication of that revelation during the period of writing, to the individual writing, which is at least a gratuitous supposition. A revelation made in any way, may be written by anybody. The revelation is heavenly, but is the writing necessarily so? To prophesy requires the secret inspiration and direct communication of heaven; but does he who pens the prophecy absolutely require this assistance? Is it fair to say, that, because a volume contains myste-

ries impervious to human reason, and above man's conception, records prophecies which regard periods and individuals yet unseen, and refers to positive commands which God has promulgated, it is therefore an inspired writing? Assuredly not: else every catechism, every spiritual work, and exposition of the faith and practices of Christianity, would be an inspired production. The knowledge of revelation is widely different from revelation itself. Whilst the latter is from God, the former may be the result of attention and memory. A Jew or Gentile, who heard Christ speaking of his Church, and announcing the saving truths of Christianity, may have written down every word, have written it as faithfully as even the Apostles themselves. To do this, memory sufficed. The same may be said relative to those who heard the Apostles. Their hearers may have understood and remembered every syllable which was uttered; this too they might have penned; and yet in neither case, would the *writings* of such persons have been inspired. Those writings would contain indeed revelations; but still the composition would be essentially man's, and not God's work. In a word, prophecies or mysteries when committed to writing, do not by any means involve the supposition of their being then primarily communicated when committed to paper. All that they suppose is this, that they have been revealed: the *time*, the *how*, the *person*, being in no wise involved in the *enunciation* of the revelation. Hence those argue illogically who infer the inspiration of the writer from the inspiration of facts, and conclude that the writer must have been inspired, because he communicated the truths of inspiration.

To those unacquainted with modern writings, and in-

deed, with older compositions of distinguished scholars,[1] these observations may appear superfluous, but by the scholar they will be adjudged necessary; for numerous writers have fallen into this error, and have argued on this point in a manner unworthy of the reputation which they had otherwise so well merited.

To proceed: the extent of inspiration is again a matter deserving of consideration. "That the authors of these books (the books of the Old Testament,) were *occasionally* inspired," observes Pretyman, "is certain, since they frequently display an acquaintance with the counsels and designs of God, and often reveal his future dispensations in the clearest predictions. But though it is evident that the sacred historians *sometimes* wrote under the immediate operation of the Holy Spirit, it does not follow that they derived from revelation the knowledge of those things, *which might be collected from the common sources of human intelligence.*" Obviously, it appears to be conceded, that though *portions* of the Scriptures are inspired, this inspiration is not so essential that nothing can be called scripture which is not inspired: and this is afterwards distinctly conceded. "If it be asked," it is said, "by what rule we are to distinguish the inspired from the uninspired parts of these books, I answer, that no general rule can be prescribed for that purpose. Nor is it necessary that we should be able to make any such discrimination."

Even *supernatural assistance* is not deemed requisite

[1] See Calmet's Dissertation on the Inspiration of the Sacred Scripture vol. i, p. 58; as also Sardagna, vol. ii, p. 100, in proof of my positions Protestants, as a body, formerly and now, argue in the inconclusive manner referred to in the text.

in the composition of some parts of the sacred volumes. "We may, in like manner, suppose," the same writer continues, "that some of the precepts delivered in the books called *Hagiographa*, were written *without any supernatural assistance*, though it is evident that others of them exceed the limits of human wisdom; and it would be equally impossible, as in the historical scriptures, to ascertain the character of particular passages which might be proposed. But here again, a discrimination would be entirely useless. The books themselves furnish sufficient proofs that the writers of them *were occasionally inspired*, and we know also that they were frequently quoted, particularly the Psalms, as prophetical, by our Saviour and his Apostles, in support of the religion which they preached. Hence we are under an indispensable obligation to admit the divine authority of the whole of these books, which have the same claim to our faith and obedience, as if they had been written under the influence of a constant and universal inspiration."[2]

Nor is the Bishop of Lincoln singular, in his account of the nature and extent of inspiration. In a long, and generally able article on *Revelation*, in vol. xix of the *Penny Encyclopædia*, the reader will peruse the "*various theories* which have been put forth," on the question of scriptural inspiration, which have been advocated by persons of eminence; to wit, the theory of *verbal inspiration*, the theory of *plenary inspiration*, in respect to every fact, whether historical, moral, or doctrinal; and the theory of partial inspiration, and partial liability to err, which is thus described: "Lastly, there are many, and amongst them divines of great eminence, and reputed orthodoxy,

[2] See Pretyman's Christian Theology, vol. i, p. 21, 28.

and not a few distinguished prelates of the English Church, who limit the extent of inspiration as commonly received, and suppose that parts of Scripture may have been written with the liability to error incident to ordinary histories; those, for instance, which are purely historical, and contain no religious truth."

It would seem, indeed, that all idea of inspiration, as essential to the nature of a sacred volume, has been overlooked by some Anglican ministers. For example, Fellowes, in the very first page of his Concordance of the Evangelists,[1] thus writes: "St. Luke's preface is a very important part of the evangelical records; for it fully proves that he had compiled his history from the best materials which he could procure, that he had spared no pains in collecting information, that he had scrupulously traced the authenticity of every fact which he had recorded, and that the work which he had addressed to Theophilus, was not the product of miraculous inspiration, but of industrious research."

In Germany, and indeed in England too, several eminent biblical students have hardly allowed the notion of inspiration; they look upon the bulk of the sacred writers as mere epitomizers and copyists, and nothing more. Storr[2] refers SS. Matthew and Luke to S. Mark; Büsching,[3] on the other hand, maintains that S. Matthew and S. Mark have copied from S. Luke; Grotius,[4] Townson, Wetstein,[5] and Mill,[6] say that S. Mark borrowed from S. Matthew, and S. Luke from both; whilst Vogel[7] is of

[1] Guide to Immortality, vol. i, p. 1, note.
[2] Comment. Theol. vol. iii.
[3] Harmonie der Evangelien.
[4] In Matt. et Luc. c. i, 1.
[5] Præf. in Marc et Luc.
[6] Prol. § 109, 116.
[7] See Gabler's Journal, vol. i, 159.

opinion that S. Mark copied S. Luke, and S. Matthew availed himself of the labours of both; and Griesbach[8] and Ammon[9] believe that S. Mark derived much information from S. Matthew and S. Luke. Nor did even this satisfy the learning or the ignorance of the foreign divines. Eichorn, and his follower, Bishop Marsh, advocate the existence of a document, of the origin of which they know and decide nothing, and they suppose that this was the basis of all the Gospels afterwards published. The original was defective; it omitted some facts, was incorrect in others, and viewed chronologically, was worse than worthless. These defects, subsequent writers of holy writ corrected; but beyond the task of correcting, they are supposed to have done little or nothing.[10]

Such are a few out of a multitude of opinions, advocated by English and foreign divines, relative to the nature of the inspiration of the sacred volumes. From them the reader will have inferred: 1° That the word, *inspiration*, is indeed an ill-defined expression. 2° That it is plain that few or none distinctly know, what is essential to the constitution of a divine writing. And 3° That the various books of holy Scripture, cannot be supposed to bear very distinct evidence of their inspiration, seeing that so many contradictory systems have been devised, simply with the object of reconciling *terms* with *facts*, and of enabling the Christian to defend the divinity of the sacred writings from the objections of the rationalist, or the arguments of the biblical critics of our own times.

[8] Comm. Theol. vol. i (1794), &c.

[9] Diss. de Luca emend. Matt. Ed. 1805.

[10] See a *Critical Essay* on the Gospel of St. Luke, by Dr. F. Schleiermacher (1825), *passim.*

This inspiration, however, is a dogma of Protestantism; it is essential to the constitution of all and *each* of the sacred books; it is not a vague but a specific term; it embraces the Bible as a whole, and it attaches to each book, and each integral part of that book. It is, if I may so speak, the *soul* of the book; it spiritualizes, it vivifies it: without it, there is nothing which is not human; nothing which is not simply man's work, and man's creation.

But how shall this inspiration be *proved?* Whatever inspiration be, it is something not external, but *internal* to the writer; how shall this be evidenced, and so clearly as to force the prudent and the wary to admit it? After what has been said, it is too clear, that no one will stake his proofs on the internal evidences contained in the sacred writings. Every writer, nearly, adopts a different conclusion on this head, even when the writers are Christians; whilst rationalists scout the very idea of inspiration. Will it then be said, that the books announce in words their own inspiration; that S. Paul, for example, as well as other sacred writers, declare that all Scripture is inspired, and that, consequently, *it is* inspired? Surely not. It is on their inspiration that all their doctrinal authority depends; until this is established, their authority is not greater than that of the works of any honest-minded and sincere ecclesiastical writer. You must not assume the inspiration of the writer whose words you adduce; you must prove it. Even then, if the declaration of the claim to inspiration were clear and explicit, and *each book were distinctly known*, to which the Apostle referred, when he honored it with the title of Scripture, the fact remains to be established, that the witness to all the rest of the sacred writers was *inspired* to write what he did.

How will S. Paul's inspiration, on which that of S. Luke, and S. Mark, of S. Jude, and S. James hypothetically depends, be itself established? "It is not the word of God which doth, or possibly can assure us, that we do well to think that it is his word. For if any book of Scripture did give testimony to all, yet still that Scripture which giveth credit to the rest, would require another Scripture to give credit unto it; neither could we ever come to any pause whereon to rest our assurance this way."[1] Such is the clear language of the illustrious author of the "*Ecclesiastical Polity*," language which others equally learned, in the Anglican Church, have made use of, in relation to the means of discovering the number and character of the inspired writings. "It is said," says Jeremy Taylor, "that the Scripture itself is wholly derived to us by tradition, and therefore, besides Scripture, tradition is necessary in the Church. And indeed, no man that understands this question denies it: this tradition, that these books were written by the Apostles, and were delivered by the Apostles as the word of God, relies principally upon tradition universal; that is, it was witnessed to be true by all the Christian world, at their first being so consigned."[2]

It is useless to say, in order to escape the difficulty, that the Apostles were all inspired, and helped and aided by Christ and the Spirit of Truth at all times; for the question ever returns, whence is this information derived. From the Scriptures? Then 1° You either assume their inspiration; you either suppose the writings to be from God; or your position is not proved, as I have already

[1] Hooker, Eccles. Polity, b. ii, n. 4, p. 109, Ed. 1705.

[2] Taylor, vol. x, p. 426; see too p. 427.

shewn. 2° You apply the promises made to the collective body of the Apostles, to each individual; you apply promises made to Apostles as *oral teachers*, to Apostles as *writers*. Now is this fair or logical? and on such principles can anyone honestly rest his belief in the inspiration of the sacred Scriptures? Whilst Christ promised to preserve the *Apostolic line* from error, a promise, by the way, which is denied by Protestantism, he nowhere promised to secure this or that individual—always excepting blessed Peter—from mistake or error. His promises were made to the body of pastors, not to each individual; and such promises cannot be fairly applied to each person constituting that body, as is obvious in respect to promises made to other bodies. Again, as I have just noticed, the promises were made to the Apostolic body as preachers, teachers, instructors. Christ did indeed commission his Apostles to go forth to preach his Gospel, and to give them confidence, and others security, he promised ever to assist them. But did Christ bid his Apostles write; did he command them to publish works; and did he renew his promises of assistance, and declare that he and the Holy Spirit would then guide them into all truth? He did not; or at all events, the Scriptures have not recorded this important mandate and promise. 3° But if even this were conceded, the difficulty is far from being removed. For not all the writers of the New Testament were Apostles. Of the twelve, only five, if even five, wrote a word: Luke and Mark, to whom we are indebted for two of the gospels, and the Acts of the Apostles, as well as St. Paul, who wrote fourteen of the epistles, were not Apostles; and down to our own times, it has been strenuously maintained, that the Gospel of St. Matthew, in its present form,

was not the work of that Apostle.[1] Put the case then, that personal inerrancy had been promised to the members of the Apostolic college under every kind of circumstance, whether they acted as missioners or as authors, it still remains to be shewn on what grounds is based the opinion or belief of St. Luke's and St. Mark's inspiration, as also the inspiration of those other portions of the sacred writings, about the authorship of which, doubts have been, and are still entertained. Obviously, in this case, as indeed in every other, our only means of obtaining certainty and faith, is through the medium of an authority extrinsic to the Scriptures. We must, as Taylor and Hooker rightly observe, learn from tradition, and from tradition only, which are the sacred books, and what is their true character.

An important dogma, then, one all-important to the Protestant, who proves, or affects to prove, each *specific* doctrine of his religion from the Bible only, is not provable from Scripture alone. The Protestant neither knows from the Scriptures which book is inspired, nor the meaning of the phrase inspiration, nor finally, what modification of that phrase is necessarily to be adopted when it is applied to the writings which form the Bible. Whatever he does know, on these heads, he has derived from tradition; from an authority, living, teaching, pronouncing dogmatically, relative to the belief of former, as well as of present times, on all these points. In the face of these facts, how can an Anglican maintain the principle involved in the sixth Article, that nothing is to be believed which cannot be proved by the written word of God? Since I shall have to draw attention to this point a little later, I will reserve the observations I have to make on the ob-

[1] See Neander's Refutation of Strauss' Life of Christ, p. 7. *Bohn's Ed.*

vious falseness of this declaration, to the close of this chapter.

As the reader will at once see, the arguments which have been used to demonstrate the impossibility of proving the inspiration of the sacred Scriptures from the Scriptures, are equally applicable to the insufficiency of Scripture, as a rule whereby to prove the authenticity, the incorruption, and the number of the sacred writings, as well as the accuracy of the versions used by various sections of Christians. For 1° How do we know that Isaias, or Moses, Peter, or James, ever wrote a line? How do we know that those writings which pass under their names are their writings? The original manuscripts have been lost for ages; and if they even existed, *we* should be none the wiser, for their style of writing is absolutely unknown to us. From the belief of the Jews, as well as from the belief of the Christian, we learn, indeed, that these and other individuals did write; we know, moreover, from a combination of circumstances, such as serve to prove the authenticity and genuineness of any other kind of written instrument, that these writings are indeed the productions of the individuals to whom they are ascribed, and that they are the faithful records of what passed in times long since gone by; but this information is traditional, it is extrinsic, it is something beyond and out of the sacred writings themselves: it is human evidence of the same kind and character, as serves to prove the writings of Cicero or Livy, of Anacreon or Homer, of Chrysostom or Gregory. This is the extrinsic proof which scholars may have; the best proof which learning can offer; but, by the bulk of mankind, another kind of authority must necessarily be admitted, if the writings of the Old and New Testaments

re to be accepted as genuine and authentic; for men, in eneral, are unable, on many accounts, to prosecute this ritical examination. They *do* and *must* rely on general estimony, on the outward assent of nations and peoples: ney admit, in a word, this fact, on the same grounds s they receive other facts of history, other records, other estimonies in relation to events which they themselves ever witnessed, and to persons and things of which they ever had had ocular testimony. Indeed, the wisest of nen admit the Scriptures on this general authority. Even t. Austin felt himself obliged, though he was the oracle f his day, and is admitted by Protestants to be the most earned of the fathers, to acknowledge, that it was not in onsequence of his own individual and isolated researches, nat he admitted the sacred books, but on account of a eneral tradition embodied in the teaching of the Church. I would not believe the Gospel," he exclaimed, (*Contra Epist. Fund.*) "if the authority of the Church did not nduce me to do so." This language was afterwards dopted by Bishop Taylor and Hooker; it is still the anguage of all persons who deserve the name of scholars, or every scholar, everyone indeed, possessed of a rea-oning mind, sees at once and admits that evidence, testi-nony, and authority, wholly independent of the Scriptures, an alone convince us of their character, number, genuine-

[1] The reader will here appreciate the usual Protestant objection against radition. It is often said by Anglicans, when arguing against Catholics: to prove any specific doctrine, you must read all the fathers, and how an each one do this?" Of course, the objection, as usual, is in itself lse; its falsehood is manifest, from what has been said relative to the uthority of the Church: but how will the Protestant prove his knowledge the sacred books? From general tradition? That he rejects. From eading all the fathers?!

ness, inspiration, and incorruption, not to refer to other important items connected with the Bible.

And indeed, do not the framers of the Articles, seem, on one occasion at least, to throw themselves completely on uninterrupted tradition for their belief in the Scriptures? Do they not so completely rely upon it, as to believe whatever is thus evidenced, and to reject what has not this evidence? Let the reader attend to the wording of the sixth Article, and he will admit, that to authority, the framers of the Articles assign their belief in the writings which they are pleased to call Scripture, to the exclusion of every other work. "In the name of the Holy Scripture—I am citing the words of the 6th Article—we do understand those canonical books of the old and new Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church." Not to the intrinsic argument do they appeal, not from that do they state that their belief in all and each of the books is derived, but to the extrinsic proof they refer, and that proof is the uniform assent of all former ages. To this, Burnet in his proof of the sixth Article, and Pretyman, the copier of Burnet, in his *Elements of Christian Theology*, and Lardner, in his learned work, *On the Credibility of the Gospel History*, and Michaelis in his *Introduction to the Sacred Scriptures*, and Paley in his *Evidences*, refer, and on this as *the* proof of the Sacred Writings they ultimately rest.[1]

The framers of the Articles would have us believe, and all who receive the Articles should believe, that the books received by them as canonical were formerly universally admitted; that in fact no doubt about any of

[1] See all the works cited, and others of a similar character; as also Gray's *Old Testament*, &c. *passim*.

hem ever existed in the Church. The existence of doubt n regard to some works of the old Testament, is urged oo as a cause for rejecting and placing them in the rank f Apocryphal writings; of writings to which little respect ndeed has been latterly shown; for the Bible Society has eemed it advisable altogether to ignore them in its modern ditions of the Holy Scriptures.

It is time for us to test this Article, and this common elief of Protestants: and if it can be shown, 1° that some orks which they receive as unquestionably Scripture, ave been doubted of; and 2° that there is as much evi- ence for several of the so called Apocryphal writings, as here is for several of their canonical writings, it will be ill further manifest how little reliance can be placed on he dogmatical decisions of the framers of the thirty-nine rticles, and how utterly worthless must be a system, ased on such authorities.

Among the writings of the new Testament which nglicanism receives as canonical, and consequently as nquestioned at any former period, in the Church, are he following: 1° the Epistle to the Hebrews, 2° the evelations, 3° the second Epistle of S. Peter, 4° the cond and third Epistles of S. John, 5° the Epistle of S. ames, and 6° the Epistle of S. Jude. Now the sequel ill prove that all these writings have been doubted of in he Church, and doubted of by many in the Church, and at this doubt lasted for a considerable length of time.

1° Eusebius,[2] treating expressly about those Scriptures hich were acknowledged as genuine, and those which ere not, says: "This appears to me to be the proper

[2] Eusebius, E. H., l. iii, c. 25. The *certain* books are called, the ὁμολογούμενα, the *doubtful*, the ἀντιλεγόμενα, the *spurious*, νόθα.

place to give a summary statement of the books of the New Testament already mentioned. And here, among the first, must be placed the holy quarternion of the Gospels; these are followed by the book of the Acts of the Apostles; after this must be mentioned the Epistles of St. Paul; which are followed by the acknowledged First Epistle of John, as also the First of Peter, to be admitted in like manner. After these, are to be placed, if proper, the Revelation of John, concerning which we shall offer the different opinions in due time. These are, then, acknowledged as genuine. Among *the disputed books*, although they are well known and approved by many, is reputed, that called, *the Epistle of James and Jude*; also, *the second Epistle of Peter, and those called the Second and Third of John*; whether they are of the Evangelist, or of some other of the same name. Among the spurious, must be numbered the books called the Acts of Paul, and that called Pastor, and the Revelation of Peter. Besides these, the books called the Epistle of Barnabas, and what are called the Institutions of the Apostles. Moreover, as I said before, if it should appear right, *the Revelation of John*, which some, as before said, reject, but others rank among the genuine." Speaking elsewhere,[1] he observes: "These however are those that are called Peter's Epistles, of which I have understood only *one Epistle to be genuine*, and admitted by the ancient Fathers. The Epistles of Paul are fourteen, all well known and beyond doubt. It should not, however, be concealed, that some have set aside the Epistle to the Hebrews, saying, that it was disputed, as not being one of St. Paul's Epistles...."

[1] Libro iii, c. 3.

In the sixth book of his history, Eusebius appeals to and analyses some of the works of Clement of Alexandria. Referring to the *Stromata* of Clement, he says: "In these he also makes use of testimony from the ἀντιλεγόμενα, or disputed Scriptures; also from that book called, the Wisdom of Solomon, and that of Jesus the son of Sirach; also *the Epistle to the Hebrews;* that of Barnabas and Clement, and *Jude.*

From Eusebius, then, it is plain, that all the books named by me as of once doubtful authority, were at a very early period acknowledged to be such, and consequently that the Sixth Article is not only false, but also that the very foundations therein established, whereon to raise the Sacred Scriptures, are plainly unsound—unfit for the work which they were intended to uphold. From other authorities, this same fact will become plainer and plainer.

St. Jerome, in his letter to Dardanus, says: "The Epistle entitled to the Hebrews, is received not only by all the Eastern Churches, but also by all the Ecclesiastical Greek writers of former times; though many ascribe it to Barnabas, or Clement; and it is of no consequence whose it is, since it *is by some writer of the Church, and is daily read in the Churches.* And if the Latins do not receive it among the canonical writings, neither do the Greeks, using the same liberty, receive the Apocalypse." (*Epist.* 129, *tom.* ii, *p.* 608.)[2] From this testimony, it follows that the Revelations, and the Epistle of St. Paul to the Hebrews, were not respectively admitted by the

[2] See also St. Jerome's Letters to Evagrius and Paulinus, in which he distinctly states that the Epistle to the Hebrews was denied by many.

Eastern and Western Churches; and to the attentive reader it will appear more than doubtful if the Epistle to the Hebrews was looked upon even by the Easterns as a divine and inspired writing; for it was ascribed to authors whose genuine writings have not been admitted to be inspired; and the extent of St. Jerome's admissions amounts to no more than this, that it was read in the Church: a fact which in no way establishes the Scriptural character of a work in the opinion of Protestants, who read in the Church, works, the inspiration of which they strenuously oppose.

Caius, a Roman Presbyter, maintained that the Apocalypse was the production of the infamous Cerinthus;[1] nor was he singular in this belief, as may be gathered from the treatise '*On the Promises*' by the illustrious Dionysius of Alexandria. "There were (he says) some ancient writers who utterly rejected the Apocalypse, and confuted it chapter by chapter; they asserted that is was throughout ignorant and irrational, and that its very name was a fallacy, since it was not written by St. John, nor could that properly be called a revelation which was buried beneath a dark and impenetrable cloud of ignorance. It was not written, they affirmed, by any of the Apostles, nor by any pious member of the Catholic Church, *but by the heretic Cerinthus*, who wished to give to his own forgery the credit of the Apostle's name. But for myself, I do not reject a work which is looked upon with reverence by so many Christians."[2] Further, this work was not admitted by the Greeks till after the fourth century; and it was excluded from the catalogue of the Holy Scriptures named in the list published among the Apostolical

[1] Apud Euseb. H. E., l. iii, c. 28. [2] Ibid, l. vii, c. 25.

canons; from the sixty canons of the Council of Laodicea; from the catalogue of S. Cyril of Jerusalem, to which I shall presently direct the reader's attention, on account of the principle which it contains relative to the means of discovering which were and which were not, inspired writings; and also from the metrical catalogue of S. Gregory of Nazianzum. Amphilochius of Iconium does indeed, in his catalogue, refer to the Apocalypse, but his testimony will not help the Protestant; for if he state that some received it, he adds the important remark, that the majority looked upon it as certainly spurious. It is deserving of notice, too, that the Apocalypse, as well as several other writings of the New Testament, are not contained in the famous Syriac version of the Scriptures, which is certainly very ancient, and which, as Postel informs us, who travelled into the East for the express object of discovering whatever he could connected with the old version of the Scriptures, the Syrians themselves ascribe to St. Mark. Tremelius[3] maintains, that "it is probable that the version of the Syrians was made in the very infancy of the Church, either by the Apostles themselves or their disciples." Fuller is equally positive as to its merits and antiquity—"It is a most ancient, a very excellent and truly divine monument of Christianity,"[4] and Walton strives to shew that it is coeval with the Apostolic days.[5] Simon says, that "it preceded all those schisms which afterwards divided the Eastern nations into different sects; and on this account it is highly esteemed as an authoritative record."[6] Jones, too, defends its ex-

[3] Tremelius, Pref. to this version. [4] Fuller, Miscel. Sac., l. iii, c. 20.

[5] Walton's Prol., 13, § 15.

[5] Simon, Histoire Critique du N. T., part ii, c. 13, p. 121.

treme antiquity, and adduces all kinds of evidence, internal and external, in support of his opinion.[1] Now in this version are wanting, the Second Epistle of Peter; the Second and Third of St. John; the Epistle of St. Jude; and the Apocalypse; in other words, those writings which we have stated to have been either openly doubted of, or openly denied, are here entirely omitted.

In concluding this portion of our examination, I will adduce a very important passage from the fourth catechetical instruction of St. Cyril of Jerusalem: "*Learn carefully* (he says) *from the Church,* which are the Scriptures of the Old and which of the New Law; and do not read to me anything of the Apochrypha; for why shouldst thou, who knowest not what are acknowledged by all, (ὁμολογουμενα) in vain torment and trouble thyself about those which are doubtful and controverted (ἀμφιβαλλόμενα). Read the Divine Scriptures of the Old Law, the twenty-two books which the seventy-two interpreters translated. These read, and with the Apochrypha concern not thyself. Those only meditate upon which we always read openly in the churches. The Apostles and the early Bishops, the Prelates of the Church who have delivered these books, were much wiser than thou art. Do not therefore, being a child of the Church, transgress and corrupt the laws and determinations of the Fathers." Next follows a list of the books of both Testaments, with respect to which, it is to be observed, that Baruch is united to Jeremy, whilst the Apocalypse is altogether omitted. The catechist then

[1] Jones' "New and full method of settling the Canonical Authority of the New Test.," p. 110, &c. See also Wiseman's *Horæ Syriacæ*, and Butler's *Horæ Biblicæ*, vol. i, p. 165.

adds: "Let all the rest be held extraneous, and in the second rank; and those which are not read in the churches, read not thyself, as thou hast already heard." The principle of Church authority is here upheld: by it Cyril knew, and others like Cyril, which books were worthy of being read in the churches, and of being honored as divine. In what manner this authority spoke from the close of the fourth century, when, owing to the restoration of peace, and the increased facilities of communication, evidence could be sifted, and publicity given to the actual, though till then not formally promulgated, belief of the leading pastors of the Church, we shall have occasion to shew hereafter.

Whether then Protestants reject or admit authority, they will find themselves in a strange dilemma. To reject it, is to cut off the only means by which the authenticity, &c., of any work can be proved; and to admit it, either because it has been always unvarying and universal, or because it eventually became so, is to destroy in the first instance the canon which they themselves have framed; for no such universal and unvarying tradition existed from the beginning in respect to several books of holy writ, as has been already proved to evidence. But if the books be admitted because eventually the tradition became uniform, then will they be compelled to admit the Catholic Canon; for the tradition then only became uniform, when the so-called apocryphal works were acknowledged to be the written word of God.

Prior to the close of the fourth century, there is not a single catalogue of the Sacred Scriptures which wholly agrees with the Canon admitted by Protestants. The oldest catalogue known is that of Papias or Caius, to which Muratori and the venerable President of Magdalen

College, Oxford, Dr. Routh, have drawn public attention. It is certainly as old as the second century. *Wisdom* is here inserted after the Second Epistle of St. John, whilst *the Epistle to the Hebrews, that of St. James, the Third of St. John, and the Second and Third of St. Peter, are wholly omitted.* Melito, of Sardis, omits *Esther and Nehemias;* Cyril and the Council of Laodicea omit *the book of Apocalypse;* the *Apostolic Canons* enumerate among the sacred books, *Judith, three books of Machabees, with the addition of the Wisdom of Sirach, or Ecclesiasticus,* for the younger people; as also two Epistles of Clement. The Athanasian synopsis omits Esther, and admits *Baruch, the Song of the Three Children, and the history of Bel and the Dragon;* Epiphanius too receives *Baruch;* and Hilary, of Poictiers, acknowledges as divine, the Epistle of Jeremias, and also informs us that *Tobias and Judith* were looked upon by some parties as canonical works. Already I have stated what books were omitted from the ancient Syriac version; and if I refer to the *Vetus Itala,* I shall have at once drawn the reader's attention to the important fact, that in the oldest version ever made of the Sacred Scriptures, every book admitted by the Catholic Church is inserted, if not from a conviction on the part of the translators of the divinity of each work, at least from a persuasion that those books were sacred, and might ultimately be adjudged worthy of a place among the really inspired books.

At the close of the fourth century, the traditions of the Church began to assume greater consistency. In the interval which had elapsed between the cessation of persecution and the close of the fourth century, the prelates had found leisure and opportunities to collect and examine

the belief of the respective Churches of Christendom. Obviously, such an examination was requisite, from the nature of several of the sacred documents, and the remoteness of the countries which had been favoured by Apostles and others with their writings. Whilst some of the Epistles were written to the Christians at Rome, and Ephesus, and Corinth, and Galatia, others were directed to private individuals, and seemed to have been as St. Paul's Epistle to Philemon, in behalf of Onesimus, and St. John's, addressed to the charitable Gaius, intended solely for the persons to whom they were originally addressed. To give publicity to these and similar writings, to obtain evidence of their high and divine origin, required both time and a careful examination of evidence; and to search into this evidence, whilst the Emperors raged against Christianity, and its sacred records, was difficult, if not impossible. At the period named, we see the results of this examination. In the year 397, Aurelius, Bishop of Carthage, presided over a Council of Prelates, convened at his see. S. Austin assisted at it, as well as forty-three other prelates of the African Church. In this synod the following decree was passed: "That nothing besides the Canonical Scriptures be read in the Church, under the name of Divine Scriptures. And these are the Canonical Scriptures:—Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, four books of the Kingdoms, two books of the Paralipomena, Job, the Psalter of David, five books of Solomon, the books of the twelve prophets, Isaias, Jeremias, Ezekiel, Daniel, Tobias, Judith, Esther, two books of Esdras, and two books of Machabees. The books of the New Testament are:—the four books of the Gospels, one book of the Acts

of the Apostles, thirteen Epistles of the Apostle Paul, one Epistle of the same to the Hebrews, two Epistles of the Apostle Peter, three of the Apostle John, one of the Apostle Jude, and one of James, and the Revelation of John."[1] If the reader bear in mind, 1° that the Africans and others looked upon the prophecy of Baruch as the composition of Jeremias,—"Some (says St. Austin) ascribe this testimony (Baruch iii, 36, 38) not to Jeremias," but to his scribe, called Baruch, though it is usually reckoned to be from Jeremias,[2] and 2° that Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus were called the works of Solomon, as St. Austin expressly assures us—"*the two books, one called Wisdom, and the other Ecclesiasticus, are styled Solomon's,* from a certain resemblance to his writings, but are very uniformly declared to have been written by Jesus the son of Sirach, which books, however, since they have deserved to be received into authority, are to be reckoned among the prophetical writings,"—it will be manifest that every so-called Apochryphal writing was looked upon as having such extrinsic evidence in its favour as to deserve to be classed, as early as the year 397, among those Scriptures which had been received from the earliest period of the Church.

On what principles, too, the Bishops then proceeded, we may easily gather from St. Austin's famous work *on Christian Doctrine.* "Let him (he says) who desires carefully to examine the sacred writings, in receiving the Canonical Scriptures, follow the authority of the greater number of the Catholic Churches; amongst which Churches, assuredly are those which are Apostolic Sees,

[1] Labbe's Concil., t. ii, p. 1177. [2] De Civ. Dei, l. xviii, c. 33.

[3] The Acts of the Council of 397, were approved of in the Sixth Council of Carthage in 419, during the Pontificate of Boniface. See Hardouin, t. i, fol. 968.

and have received letters from the Apostles. This rule, therefore, he will observe with regard to Canonical Scriptures; he will prefer such as are received by all Catholic Churches, to those which some do not receive; and with regard to such as are not received by all, he will prefer those which are received by the greater number, and by the more eminent Churches, to those which are received by the smaller number, and by Churches of less authority. But if he should find some received by the greatest number of Churches, and others by the more eminent—which I think can scarcely happen—I think such Scriptures are to be held by him in equal authority."[4] The principle here advocated is the same as St. Cyril of Jerusalem, whose words we have already adduced, maintained. On the judgment of the Church, the Eastern and Western prelates relied for their certainty of, and belief in, the Canonical Scriptures.

Through the Pontiff of Rome, Innocent, who succeeded Anastasius in 402, the history of the Canon in its entirety became better and better known. Writing to Exuperius, Bishop of Toulouse, Innocent gives the following list of holy writings:—"The following summary will shew what books are comprised in the Canon of the Holy Scriptures. These, then, are the writings which you have desired me to mention: the five books of Moses; namely, Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy; Joshua, Judges, four books of Kingdoms, together with Ruth; sixteen books of the Prophets; five books of Solomon; the Psalter: of the historical books, one book of Job, Tobias, Esther, Judith, two books of the Machabees, two books of Esdras, and two books of Para-

[4] Libro ii, de Doct. Christ., c. 8.

lipomena. Of the New Testament, there are the four Gospels, fourteen Epistles of the Apostle Paul, three of John, two of Peter, the Epistle of Jude, that of James, the Acts of the Apostles, and the Apocalypse of John." Such was the faith of Rome when Innocent ascended the pontifical throne. The examination had been instituted in Italy and Africa, and the result was the same: the admission of the same Canon which was definitively settled more than a thousand years afterwards by the Fathers of the Council of Trent. To the enemies of Rome, I will address the language of St. Jerome, in reference to Innocent: "Keep the faith of holy Innocent, who was the successor in the Apostolic see of the above-named Anastasius;"[2] and of the Fathers assembled at Tours in 567: "What priest shall dare to oppose such decrees as have emanated from the Apostolic See?.... Let us, therefore, following the decree of Innocent, insert it among our canons, and decree that it shall be observed."[3]

The next witness, after an interval of eighty-nine years, is Pope Gelasius, in conjunction with seventy bishops, who met together in council in 494.[4] The identical canon, sanctioned by the authorities already named, was again confirmed. As a modern writer has well observed, "such confirmation had become necessary, on account of either the ignorance or perverseness of several theologians at Marseilles, who were disposed to quarrel with St. Augustine

[1] Apud Coustant. Epist. Pont. Rom., inter Innocentianas, Ep. vi, c. 7.

[2] Epist. 130, alias 8 ad Demetriadem, § 16.

[3] *Concil. Turonen. can.* xx, Labbe, t. v, p. 859. The decretal letter of Innocent to Exuperius, was written on the 20th of Feb. 405.

[4] Concil. Mansi, viii, p. 145; Labbe, iv, 1260; Hardouin, t. ii, p. 937.

for quoting from *Wisdom;* and who took upon themselves to aver, that that book was not canonical. It will be borne in mind, that about all such matters, there appears, in ecclesiastical history, just the slight amount of controversy, which tends to throw forward the real truth, and render forgery or collusion impossible. The decisions of a succession of illustrious Pontiffs at length hushed all opposition throughout the Western world." Pearson, indeed, in his vindication of the Epistles of St. Ignatius, asserts, that the author of the list of sacred writings, published in 494, is wholly unknown; and Cave in his literary history, hesitates not to say that it is absolutely supposititious. These and other writers, dreaded to acknowledge its genuineness, for reasons which need not be further referred to; but scholars are now generally agreed, that the document did emanate from the Pope whose name it bears, and this has been abundantly proved by Coustant,[5] Lupus,[6] Mabillon,[7] Pagi,[8] Fontanini,[9] and others.

It is true, indeed, that in the Gelasian decree, express mention is not made of Baruch; but I have already stated, on the authority of St. Austin, and his authority might be confirmed by a hundred references to other early ecclesiastical writings, that it was the custom to unite Baruch to Jeremias' prophecy. In some copies too, of this epistle, mention is made of only one book of Machabees; but these are incorrect. The ancient and authoritative copies of this epistle, distinctly state, that two books of Macha-

5 In diatriba de decreto Gelasii Papæ. t. ii, Epis. R. R. P. P. n. 4.
6 Bib. P. P. t. xv, Ep. 128.
7 In disq. de Cursu Gallicano, § 1, n. 9.
8 Ad ann. 494.
9 De Antiq. hort. l. ii, c. 3.

bees entered into the canon of the sacred Scriptures.[1] But even if the text were such as it is represented, it would not contradict either the former decrees of Carthage and Innocent, or the later ones of Eugenius and Trent; for these two books contain but one and the same history, in consequence of which, both Jews and Greeks cited them as one work, as we learn from St. Jerome and St. Isidore.

From the close of the fifth century, the same canon of Scriptures seems to have been followed, throughout nearly the whole world; and almost every individual, whose task it was to pass any observation on the sacred writings, refers to each book of this canon as unquestionable Scripture, down to the fifteenth age, when a Pontiff again gave expression to the belief of the Church on this head. As intermediate witnesses between the times of Gelasius and Eugenius, I will refer the reader to the illustrious Hincmar,[2] who names the catalogue of Gelasius, without, however, adducing the words of it; and to the illustrious preceptor of Charlemagne, who was the glory of our country, Alcuin.[3] In his work, which is entitled, "*A Disputation of Children, on various matters,*" Alcuin thus proceeds: "Into how many books is the Old Testament divided? Answer: Into forty-five. *Q.* How are they called? *A.* Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Jesus Nave, Judges, Ruth, four books of the kingdoms, two books of the Paralipomena, Job, the Psalter of David, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, the Canticle of Canticles, sixteen books of the Prophets, Tobias, Judith, Hesther,

[1] See the copies published by Holstein and Schelstrate, and Chifflet; as also Hardouin, t. ii, col. 937.

[2] Vol. ii, p. 638. [3] Vol. ii, p. 431.

and Machabees. *Q.* Are there any other books of the Old Testament? *A.* There are. *Q.* Which are they? *A.* Some add Ruth and Cynoth, which in Latin is called "Lamentatio," the Lamentation of Jeremias, to the sacred writings, and make twenty-four volumes of the Old Testament, according with the number of the elders who assisted before the throne of the Lord. *Q.* Are there any other books of the Old Testament? *A.* Yes. *Q.* What do you mean? *A.* There is a fourth class of those books, which are not in the Hebrew canon. *Q.* How are they named? *A.* The first is the book of Wisdom, the second Ecclesiasticus, the third Tobi, the fourth Judith, the fifth and sixth the Machabees, *which though classed by the Jews among the Apocrypha, the Church of Christ honors and extols as divine books.*" These last words had previously been used by S. Austin, and they contain the principle, whereby divine were distinguished from merely human—sacred from common writings.

As the Council of Florence, which is mainly memorable in the annals of ecclesiastical history, for the temporary reunion of the Latin and Greek Churches, was terminating, the ambassadors of the Patriarch of Armenia, who was at the head of a numerous but schismatical Church, arrived at Florence, in order to unite their Church, if this could be effected, with the Church in communion with Rome. This object was speedily accomplished. Prior, however, to the departure of the deputies, the Pontiff drew up a decree, containing many points of instruction, which were adjudged by him to be either necessary or useful for the united Church; and the number of books which formed the Ecclesiastical Canon, was one of the matters which was distinctly named. In this document, the

list of the sacred books corresponds exactly with the list already given—a list which was eventually sanctioned by the decree of the fathers assembled together at Trent,[1] and guarded by an anathema, directed against those who should hereafter dare to say, that the books admitted by the Church as Scripture, *were not sacred and canonical.*

And if we now pass from a general to a specific statement; if, no longer consulting catalogues, we turn to particular authorities in favour of each of the books which Protestants have rejected, we shall not fail to find floating evidence, in nearly every quarter, of the existence of a tradition in various portions of the Church, regarding the divinity of the books which the one Church of God universally admits. It would be a nearly endless task to adduce full proofs in favour of each of the rejected divine writings; a few authorities will, under circumstances, be deemed, by the general reader, amply sufficient.

1° Tobias. This work is cited as Scripture, by 1° St. Cyprian: in his work, "*De Opere et Eleemosynis*," he says (page 303, Ed. 1616.), that "the Holy Spirit says in the divine Scriptures, that almsgiving freeth from death." —(Tobias, c. xii, 9.). And further (page 308), he cites c. ii, 4, and c. iv, in proof of the religious instructions which Tobias gave his son, in regard to corporal works of

[1] Modern writers are for ever sneering at what they call the small number of those who passed the decree at Trent. But what are the facts? There were present one hundred and one distinguished individuals: five cardinals, eight archbishops, forty bishops, five generals of religious orders, three abbots, and forty of the picked scholars of Europe, who assisted the prelates by their learning and abilities. This decree received the approval of the hundreds who assisted at the last session. What authority can Anglicanism offer like this, for *the Anglican Scriptures?*

mercy. 2° St. Ambrose,[2] in two works calls this book "*Scripture, and a prophetical work.*" 3° St. Austin, l. ii, c. 8, *De Doct. Christ.* where he professedly treats on the sacred Scriptures, ranks Tobias in the number of sacred writings.[3] St. Hilary proves, from the intercourse of Raphael and Tobias, two things: that angels exist, and that they assist men. St. Chrysostom refers to it in his fifteenth Homily on the Hebrews; and St. Isidore[4] calls it, in conjunction with Ecclesiasticus, Wisdom, Judith, and the Machabees, *divine Scripture.* As we have seen too, it was admitted by Innocent I, in his letter to Exuperius; by Gelasius, in the Roman synod; and by the fathers assembled on three different occasions at Carthage; and it was inserted in the edition of the Scriptures called *the Seventy*, as also in the *Vetus Itala*, the oldest Christian translation in existence. In fine, Origen distinctly refers to it as sacred Scripture.[5]

2° *Judith.* The book of Judith was admitted into the canon of Scripture, by the fathers assembled together at the great and important Council of Nice; and in consequence of this acceptance, and the persuasion of friends, St. Jerome was induced to translate it, as well as other sacred writings. "The book of Judith," he says, "which is considered as less suitable as an authority in controverted questions, is read by the Jews among the sacred

[2] L. vi, c. 4, in Hexemeron; and l. de Tobia, c. 1.

[3] See the place cited.

[4] L. vi, c. 1, Etymol. Sapientia, Ecclesiasticus, Tobias, Judith, Maccabæorum (libri), quos licet Hebræi inter Apocrypha separent, Ecclesia tamen Christi inter divinos libros et honorat et prædicat." The reader will have seen that these precise words were adopted by Alcuin.

[5] Origen, l. v, contra Celsum, p. 244.

writings (hagiographa). Being written, however, in Chaldaic, it is ranked amongst the historical books. But as *the Council of Nice is recorded* to have reckoned this book in the number of the holy Scriptures, I have yielded to your request, or rather to your command, and have translated it."[1] It is cited by St. Clement of Rome,[2] Clement of Alexandria,[3] Origen,[4] Tertullian,[5] Isidore,[6] and Hilary of Poictiers,[7] without hesitation; and it is plain that they must have felt what the Church now believes, and has for ages believed, that the work was really divine. Add to this the statement of St. Jerome, relative to its being admitted among the Hagiographa, and the decisions of the fathers at Carthage and at Rome, and the character of the work will be readily admitted to be clearly established.

3° *Wisdom.* St. Polycarp has left us one brief epistle. Though there is scarcely an allusion to the Old Testament, in his Epistle to the Philippians, we have evidence of his belief in respect to the book of Wisdom. It is cited as *the work of a prophet,* p. 13, Ed. *Le Moyne.* Polycarp's scholar and disciple, St. Irenæus, as Eusebius informs us,[8] cited this work, in a book which has been since lost,

[1] Præf. in lib. Judith. If the Jews, as St. Jerome states, ranked Judith among the Hagiographa, must they not have acknowledged it to be a portion of the Scripture? Assuredly, many of the fathers, and St. Jerome is one of the number, constantly assure us, that the Jewish Scriptures were divided into *the Law, the Prophets,* and *the Hagiographa.* See the *Prol. Galeatus* of St. Jerome, as also his *Preface to the book of Daniel,* in which this triple division is retained.

[2] Epist. 1, ad Cor.
[3] L. iv, Strom. p. 521.
[4] Hom. xix, in Jer.
[5] C. ult. de Monog.
[6] L. vi, c. 6, Etymol. and l. vii, c. 8, et l. de vitâ Sanc. c. 64.
[7] In Psal. cxxv.
[8] H. E. l. v, c. 26.

entitled, *A Treatise on Various Matters;* and in his book *On Heresies,* he again refers to it, citing c. vi, 20.[9] Clement of Alexandria, referring to the third chapter, calls this the divine Wisdom. "The divine Wisdom," he says, "says of martyrs, 'they seemed to the eyes of the foolish to die.'"[10] Equally emphatic is the great biblical scholar, Origen: "We read and know, from the sacred books, that God loves all things that are, and hates none of the things which he has made, for there was nothing which he disliked. And we read too, that 'he has mercy upon all, because he can do all things, and overlooks the sins of men for the sake of repentance.'"—Wisdom, xi, 24-5.[11] St. Cyprian, too, bears witness to the faith of the African Church: "The Holy Spirit has shown and declared, through Solomon, saying, and 'though in the sight of men they suffered torments, their hope is full of immortality.'"—Wisdom iii, 4.[12] Thus he declares two things: 1° That Solomon was the author of the book of Wisdom; and 2° That what was said, emanated from the Holy Spirit. It is also called the work of Solomon by Methodius;[13] by St. Athanasius it is honored with the names of "*the Wisdom of God,*" and "*the Scripture;*"[14] and by the bishops of Egypt, Lybia, and Pentapolis, who espoused the cause of the sainted Archbishop of Alexandria, it is said, citing Wisdom, "Let them fear that which is written in the sacred Scriptures .... 'The mouth that belieth, killeth the soul.'"—Wisdom i, 11.[15] St. Cyril of Jeru-

[9] Adv. hær. l. iv, c. 75.
[10] L. iv, Strom. et alibi passim.
[11] L. iv, c. Celsum, p. 178.
[12] De Exhort. Martyrii.
[13] Apud. Epiph. hær. 64, n. 19 and 30.
[14] Tom. i, p. 11, Contra Gentes, and p. 12.
[15] Ad Imp. Constant. Apol. tom. i, p. 723, opp. S. Athanasii.

salem too, calls this Solomon's work, when he adduces the xiii chapter, v. 5, of Wisdom;[1] and St. Hilary entitles the writer *a Prophet:*[2] .... "The prophet teaches us, saying, 'the Spirit of God hath filled the whole world.'" —Wisdom i, 7. Nor is the language of Epiphanius less emphatic; indeed, he classes this work with those writings which were unquestionable, and cites it in such a way as to leave no doubt of his own convictions. Writing against the heretic Aetius, he thus expresses himself: "Even had you, Aetius, been born of the Spirit, it behoved you to do this: that after turning over all the sacred records from Genesis to Esther, which are in number twenty-seven, though reduced to twenty-two; also the four sacred Gospels, and the fourteen Epistles of Paul, the Acts, also, of the Apostles, ... and the Catholic Epistles of James, Peter, John and Jude, the Apocalypse of John, the books of Wisdom, namely of Solomon, the Son of Sirach; after, in fine, running over all the books of Scripture, you might condemn yourself...."[3] And again, refuting Hierarcus, he calls the writer of Wisdom, iv, 8, *the blessed and wise Solomon—the most blessed of prophets;*[4] and this same authorship is ascribed to Wisdom, by St. Basil of Cæsarea,[5] who repeatedly quotes the work when confuting heresy, and defending the truth. If the reader wish for further authorities, which will hardly be the case, for surely the evidence already adduced, coming from the East and the

[1] Cat. ix, p. 75.
[2] Tract. in Psal. 145; see too enar. in Psal. 127.
[3] Adv. hær. l. iii, hær. 76.
[4] L. v, contra Eunom.; Epist. cxli, &c.
[5] Hom. in Prov. t. ii, p. 100.

West, from countries far remote, and regarding periods widely distant, is overpowering, he may consult the author of the work, *De Divinis Nominibus*,[6] *Eusebius*,[7] *St. Ambrose*,[8] *St. Austin*,[9] and *the Councils*, which I shall refer to in the note below.[10]

4° *Ecclesiasticus.* Clement of Alexandria repeatedly refers to Ecclesiasticus, as an inspired writing;[11] and Tertullian cites it as a portion of the old law;[12] nor does either Origen or Cyprian doubt of its divine character. The former says: "Let us prove from the sacred writings, that *the divine Scripture* also recommends to us the study of dialectics, it being said in the wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach, 'the knowledge of the unwise is as words without sense.'" (Ecclus. xxi, 21;)[13] and the latter observes: "We are taught and admonished by *the divine Scriptures* thus: 'Son, when thou comest to the service of God, stand in justice and in fear.'" (Ecclus. ii, 1.) S. Athana-

[6] De Div. Nomin. c. 4.

[7] L. vii, c. 12; l. ix, c. 7; l. xi, c. 14, *Præp. Evang.*

[8] Enarrat. in Ps. 1.

[9] l. ii, c. 8, de *Doct. Christ.;* l. xvii, c. 20, *de Civ. Dei; and* l. de prædest Sanct. c. xvi. St. Austin, vindicating his and St. Cyprian's use of the book of Wisdom, against the ignorance of some persons who would not admit the work to be Scripture, says, "Non debuit repudiari sententia libri Sapientiæ, qui meruit in Ecclesia Christi de gradu lectorum Ecclesiæ Christi tam longâ annositate recitari, et ab omnibus Christianis, ab Episcopis usque ad extremos laicos fideles, pœnitentes, catechumenos, cum veneratione divinæ auctoritatis, audiri."—l. c.

[10] See *Concil. Sardicen*, apud Theodoret, Hist. l. ii, c. 8; Concil. Carthag. iii, c. 47; Concil. Triburiense, c. 34, et C. Nicæn ii, act. 4.

[11] Apud Euseb. H. E. l. vi, 13; See Clement of Alex. l. i, c. 8; Pædag. et l. viii, Strom. p. 763.

[12] See Adv. Marc, p. 464; and Exhort. ad Cast. c. xii, p. 662.

[13] L. viii, contra Celsum. p. 410; and Homil. 9, in Ezech.

[14] De Mortal. p. 174, et *de Opere et Eleemos.*

sius also cites it as Scripture: "Thou shalt not sup with a proud woman, nor shalt thou be familiar with an arrogant woman; for sacred Scripture says: 'He who toucheth pitch, shall be defiled by it.'" (Ecclus. xiii, 1.)[1] S. Basil thus refers to it: "The divine letters say, 'Do nothing without counsel, &c.'" (Ecclus. xxxii, 24.)[2] We have already seen what was the received canon of the sacred Scriptures in the time of Cyril of Jerusalem; now we have to learn what was his own opinion relative to Ecclesiasticus. This saint was thoroughly acquainted with the book under investigation; to it he often refers, and in one instance at least he calls it Scripture. "The Scripture says, speaking of our souls, 'he created in them the Science of the Spirit.'"—xvii, 6.[3] S. Hilary informs us that the Latins looked upon Ecclesiasticus as the work of Solomon, whilst both Jews and Greeks entitled it the book of Jesus the son of Sirach; and to it the Saint refers, in the same manner as he does to the fully recognized Scriptures.[4] What Epiphanius' opinion was, we have already seen in a previous extract: to another passage from one of his writings, I will limit my references to his works. "Since the Divine Scripture reprehends us, saying: 'Seek not the things that are too high for thee, and search not into things which are too deep for thee.'" (Ecclus. iii, 12.)[5] John Maxentius adopts similar language: "It is necessary to contend for the truth to the effusion of blood; especially as the Divine Scripture thus admonishes us, and says—'For thy soul be not ashamed to say the truth; and even unto death fight for

[1] L. de Virgin, as also Orat. i, contra Arianos, tom. i, p. 319.
[2] *In reg. fusius tract.* reg. 104.
[3] Cat. xvi, p. 181.
[4] In Ps. 140, et alibi passim.
[5] In Anchorato, c. xii.

justice.' "—(Ecclus. iv, 24, 33.)[6] Even St. Jerome entitles it *Divine Scripture* in one of his letters: "The Divine Scripture says—'a tale out of time is like music in mourning.' "—(Ecclus. xxii, 6.)[7] And the Fathers of the Ephesine Synod, with whose authority I shall close this critical survey, call the work Divinely inspired Scripture: "Do nothing without counsel, says the Divinely inspired Scripture."—(Ecclus. xxxii, 24.)[8]

5° *Baruch.* Circumstances have forced me already to draw the reader's attention to the fact, that the writings of Baruch, the scribe of Jeremias, are very commonly annexed by the Fathers of the Church to those of Jeremias: and from this fact it may be easily inferred that the divinity of this portion of Holy Writ was uniformly admitted. I will, however, adduce a few specific proofs in order to satisfy the scholar on this head.

St. Irenæus calls Baruch *an inspired prophet,* and his writings are distinctly named *the word of God.* "And therefore, (he says) have the prophets who have received the prophetic gift from the same word (λογος) foretold his advent in the flesh, by which the commixture and communion of God and man was effected in accordance with the will of the Father; the word of God foretelling from the beginning, that *God should be seen by men, and that he would converse with them on earth.*" (Baruch iii, 38.)[9] And later, this same writer quotes as the work of Jeremias the whole of the fifth chapter of Baruch.[10]

[6] Præf. dial. c. Nestorianos. [7] Epist. xxxiv, ad Julianum.

[8] Epist. ad Synod. Pamphyliæ, act vii. For further information the reader may consult Cornelius à Lapide, *præf. in Eccles.;* Widenhoffer, vol. ii, 366-8; and Natalis Alexander, tom. iii, p. 691-2, Ed. 1786.

[9] Adv. hær. l. iv, c. 37. [10] Ibid. l. v, c. 35.

Tertullian cites the work as the production of Jeremias: "Let them remember too, Jeremias, who thus writes, *now shall* ye see the gods of the Babylonians of gold and silver and wood carried away, &c."[1]—(Baruch, vi, 3;) and St. Cyprian refers to it in a similar manner: "Also in the prophet Jeremias we read, *This is our God*, and there shall no other be accounted of in comparison of him," (Baruch iii, 36;)[2] as does also St. Hilary.[3] St. Clement of Alexandria, is another witness: "Most beautifully does the divine Scripture elsewhere say, directing its words to those who are lovers of themselves and arrogant, 'Where are the princes of the nations, and they that rule over the beasts that are upon the earth, that take their diversion with the birds of the air, &c." (Baruch, iii, 16, 18.)[4] St. Athanasius often cites the work as that of Jeremias, and from the words "this is our God" derives a proof of Christ's divinity;[5] and *Lactantius* also quotes as Scripture the adduced words, "this is our God."[6] As we have already seen, *St. Cyril of Jerusalem* considered Baruch to be a sacred writer,[7] and he, like almost all the Fathers, refers to and cites Chap. iii, 38. In the list of sacred books published by the Council held at Laodicea, about the middle of the fourth century, Baruch occurs after Jeremias. In the address of *St. Cyril of Alexandria* at Ephesus, the famous text of Baruch is thus adduced: "Take as witnesses the holy prophets; does not Baruch nearly pointedly

[1] Adver. Gnosticos p. 595.
[2] L. ii, c. 6, Testim. p. 206.
[3] In Ps. 68, n. 19.
[4] L. ii, Pædag. c. 3.
[5] De Sanc. Trin. Dial. iii; as also see l. ii, c. Arianos, for an extract from *Baruch*, c. iv.
[6] L. iv, p. 346.
[7] See also his Cat. xxi, in addition to previous references.

demonstrate the Emmanuel, for he says, 'He is our God, and none other shall be compared with him.'"[8] Although *St. Gregory of Nazianzum*, in the catalogue of the sacred books which he drew up, does not expressly name Baruch, yet that he looked upon this as a portion of Scripture, and as divine, is certain. He too, refers to Baruch iii, 38, as written by the *most approved of the prophets*.[9] As St. Austin observes,[10] though the words cited were by some ascribed to Baruch the scribe of Jeremias, they were more commonly cited as those of Jeremias. In fine, this work is adduced as Scripture by the illustrious and learned prelate *St. Epiphanius:* "These are the twenty-seven books which are counted as twenty-two, together with the Psalter, and the pieces which are united to Jeremias, namely, the Lamentations and the Epistles of Baruch, *although these Epistles are not found amongst the Jews*."[11] For further information, I refer the reader to *Coccius*, l. vi, art. xi, *and Sylvius de Controv.*, p. 49.

6° *Esther*. As the learned *de Rossi* observes, "So great is the connexion between the protocanonical portions of Esther, and the deuterocanonical additions to this book, that the denial of the latter necessitates the denial of the former also."[12] For 1° as he justly states, many things are said in the book itself to have been written, which really occur in the *additions*, as certain passages of the book of Esther are commonly called. The truth of this observation may be easily seen by comparing c. iv, 8, with xiii,

[8] *In Homilia Ephesi habitâ.*

[9] See Orat. xxxix; as also Orat. xxxvi.

[10] De Civ. Dei. l. xviii, c. 33.

[11] De Ponder. et Mens. t. ii, n. 5, p. 163.

[12] Specimena Variarum Lectionum, p. 117.

1, 7; iv, 15-7, with xiii, 8, 18; ii, 23, and vi, 1, 2, with xi and xii, 4; and viii, 9, 10, with xvi. 2° These so-called additions are found in the edition of the Septuagint, as also in the Vulgate, Syriac, Arabic, and other ancient copies of the sacred Scriptures. 3° Josephus,[1] even, cites a letter of Assuerus, perfectly agreeing with that contained in these additions: and further, he supplies us with an analysis of the speeches of Mardochæus and Esther, as also with an account of Esther's visit to Assuerus, and their conversation, and with a history of the royal letters sent by Aman to the princes of the provinces, relative to the murder of the Jews. How in the face of all this, Calmet[2] can have fearlessly stated that Josephus says not a word about these additions, is to me perfectly unintelligible. 4° These additions exist in three most ancient *MSS.*, one of which belonged to Pius VI, the second to the Vatican, and the third to the Ambrosian Library. In the MS. of Pius, these additions are written by the same hand and in the same character as the preceding portions of Esther, and at the end of the work occurs a clause, which uniformly indicates the sacred character of such works, viz., the number of verses, &c., contained in the book. In the Vatican MS. these distinctions of sacred Scripture are wanting; but in that of Milan, the points, accents, and masoretic epigraphe occur. The writing however of the additions is not quite so large as that of the preceding portions of the inspired instrument. 5° Finally, the Fathers refer, and continually too, to these additions.

Origen, replying to Africanus, who had refused, it would seem, to admit the history of Susannah and other portions of Daniel, because these *were not received by the Jews*,

[1] Antiq. Judæi, l. xi, c. 6. [2] Prol. in Esther.

makes the following important and useful observation: "The two sections at the end of the book of Daniel, which are spread throughout the Church of Christ, are not the only portions of the Old Law which are not in the Hebrew text, since even about two hundred verses, to speak by guess, are omitted from another part of Daniel, and are consequently excluded by Aquila, although inserted in the Septuagint version, and in that of Theodotion. Nor is this peculiar to Daniel; since the same omissions are found in many of the other sacred writings. ....In the book of Esther, for example....neither the prayer of Mardochai, nor of Esther....are received by the Jews, neither are the letters of Aman respecting the massacre of the Jews, nor of Mardochai, in the name of Artaxerxes, freeing the same people from the sentence of death." He eventually endeavours to shew how these passages had been struck out of the Hebrew copies; and the omissions he ascribes to the wickedness of the Jews, who wilfully destroyed them for political reasons.[3] St. Cyril was a great admirer of the Septuagint. As we have already seen, he recommends that edition to the Christians of his times, and personally he believed that that edition was inspired. Since then, we know, that in the Septuagint, the additions of Esther occur, we are forced to conclude, that they were received by Cyril as well as by Origen and others, as Holy Scripture.[4]

The fathers of the Western Church are equally explicit. (See S. Hilary, Præf. in Ps., S. Jerome, in Prol. galeato, and Præf. in Esther, &c.) And indeed, since these chapters, now expunged from Protestant versions, uniformly occurred in the old Vulgate, and not as now, disjointed

[3] Ad Afric. p. 222,

[4] See Cat. iv, previously cited.

and separated, but in their natural order, (the present allocation was the work of St. Jerome,) it is plain that the Latins could not have admitted any portion of the book of Esther without admitting the entire work.[1] Thus the Greeks who followed the Septuagint, and the Latins who adopted the ancient Italic version, equally admitted the rejected chapters. See too St. Chrysostom, hom. iii, ad pop. Antioch, August. Epist. 199, ad Ediciam, &c., and Bellarmine, l. i, c. 7, *de Verbo Dei.*

But who was the author of the so-called additions? That Mardochæus wrote some portion of the book of Esther is plain from ix, 20, and xii, 4; and it is equally clear from the Septuagint, that Esther too had a share in the composition of the work. To me, it seems more than probable, and this is likewise the opinion of De Rossi, p. 128-9, l. c., that formerly another work of Esther existed. This may be proved from the following words of c. ix, 32, as literally translated from the Hebrew—"And the word of Esther confirming the things of those lots, was written in *the book.*" Obviously these words refer not to this, but to some prior writing, and thus they have been ordinarily understood by both Jewish and Christian writers. This work, as we gather from references made to it in viii, 9, and ix, 20, of Esther, contained the letters, &c. that were written by Mardochæus, which were widely

[1] The Church tolerated this alteration in the chapters, in order that the faithful might know, what was and what was not in the Jewish Bible. With regard to the seven last chapters, the inspiration of which Catholics defend, and heretics deny, it may be as well to observe, that chapters xi, and xii, belong strictly to the beginning of the work; xiii, xiv, xv and xvi, to the middle, and chapter x, to the end, as is clear from the Septuagint, from the Vetus Itala, from St. Jerome's observations on chapters xi, xii, &c., as also from the book itself.

circulated among the Jews, as is evident from the last reference. To procure copies of such letters involved no difficulty; and it will not be rash to suppose that the seventy, having made themselves thoroughly acquainted with their history, translated and eventually inserted them in proper chronological order in that version which Christ and his Apostles ordinarily cited, which many fathers of the Church, as Austin, &c., believed to have been inspired, and which was in general honor throughout the Eastern and Western Churches.[2]

[2] It may be expected of me to say a few words about this edition of the Sacred Scriptures. Its history briefly told is this: 1° In the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus, who succeeded, it is calculated, to the crown of Egypt, 285 years before the birth of Christ, the Jews settled in Egypt, being very ignorant, and without, it is said, any version of the law which they professed, were forgetting even the rites and practices of their religion. To obviate this inconvenience, as well as to enrich the library of his sovereign, Demetrius Phalereus, who was then Ptolemy's librarian, proposed to call to Alexandria, a number of Jews, perfectly conversant with both the Greek and Hebrew tongues, in order to translate into the former language, the Scriptures. Ptolemy assented. He wrote to the Jewish High Priest, begging of him to send to Alexandria six persons from every tribe, distinguished for their learning and integrity, who might undertake the task of translation. To gain his end, he restored to liberty all the Jews who were then slaves in Egypt, he himself paying the price of their ransom, which amounted to the enormous sum of 660 talents. The letter was carried to the Pontiff by one Andrew and Aristeas, from whom we are said to have derived a full account of this translation, who went from Egypt laden with presents for the High Priest, Eleazarus. The Pontiff readily granted the favour asked. Seventy-two persons went to Alexandria, and thence they were sent to the Island of Pharos, where in seventy-two days they are said to have accomplished their task. The translation was read in the presence of the Hellenistic Jews, and of other competent witnesses, and by them was declared to be a faithful version of the inspired original. Such is an abridged account of the history of the pseudo-Aristeas.

2° But *fama vires acquirit eundo:* with time the particulars and details

7° Daniel. We will now proceed to the examination of the evidence in favour of those passages of Daniel

regarding this version increased, and swelled out into wonderful importance. By Philo, we are informed, (in vita Mosis, l. ii,) that the Holy Spirit dictated every word to each writer; and hence it was found, at the conclusion of their labours, that all the translations agreed to the letter. Justin Martyr enters more into details. He tells us that each writer had a separate cell, and that all communication between the translators was entirely cut off. (Apol. ii.) St. Epiphanius is less liberal; for he assigns to these translators only thirty-six cells. (De Pond. n. 6.)

3° To separate truth from falsehood may not be very easy in this case; but I will observe, 1° that the Fathers, &c., seem, as a body, to admit the general accuracy of the statement ascribed to Aristeas. It is admitted by Justin M., l. c; by Clement of Alexandria, l. i, Strom.; by Tertullian, c. xviii, Apol.; by St. Irenæus, l. iii, c. 25, adv. hær.; St. Cyril of Jerus. cat. iv; St. Epiphanius, l. c; St. Augustin, l. xviii, c. 42-3, de Civ. Dei et l. ii, c. 15, de Doct. Christ.; as well as by Philo, l. c; Josephus, Antiq. Judaic. l. xii, c. 2; and Aristobulus, apud Euse . de Præp. Evang. l. xiii, c. 7. To reject such a weight of authority without evidence would be more than rash; and counter evidence does not exist; for I cannot suppose that such as Didacus a S. Antonio has adduced, vol. i, p. 472, can have weight with any reasonable critic. To me, Serrarius, Bonfrere, Vossius, Usher, Walton, Morinus, Nicolai, and numerous other writers, seem to have adopted a wiser course in defending, than have Bellarmine, Scaliger, Valesius, Hody, Vandale, Dupin and Simon, in opposing the general truth of the narrative just adduced. That a translation was made in the reign of Ptolemy, and under very extraordinary circumstances, and with extraordinary results, appears indisputable; though I am prepared to say with St. Jerome—"I know not who first *fabricated* the story of the seventy cells at Alexandria," (Præf. in Pent. et l. ii, n. 25, cont. Rufinum,) and that "*the writers conferred together, and did not prophesy.*" (Loc. cit.) Again, I think that the seventy-two did not translate all the Hebrew Canon, but only *the law,* or the five books of Moses. And I adopt this conclusion on the authority, 1° of Josephus, and of the Jews in general, 2° of Aristeas; and 3° of St. Jerome, who justly observes, that whilst the Pentateuch agrees literally with the Hebrew, the other books do not. Nay more, in the other books, the same phrases are differently translated, from what they are in the books of the *Law.* See St. Jerome on this head, Præf. Quest. Hebraic in Gen., and in. c. ii,

which have been recklessly rejected by the Anglican Church, namely, 1° *the hymn of the three youths;* 2° *the history of Susannah;* and 3° *the history of Bel and the Dragon.* Not only are these passages of holy writ rejected, but one of them at least has been treated with words of scorn hardly equalled by those used by the Jews, when they cast away Christ, and insulted him on the cross, or adopted by Voltaire in the last, and the Rationalists of Germany in this century, in reference to the Scriptures in general, or those very books which Protestantism *still* clings to, as divine. Rejection and strong language, prove nothing of themselves; and of this, Anglicans should be mindful when they resort to violent and abusive expressions, whilst opposing either this written revelation of Bel and the Dragon, or the peculiar dogmas of Catholicity. At all events, we shall soon see, that the Fathers wrote like the Catholics of the present day, and not as Protestants; and that they could not have approved of the violent and indecent phraseology in which the followers of Elizabeth indulge.

1° *Hymn of the Three Youths. Tertullian* calls this a portion of Daniel. "To whom incorporeal things sing praises in Daniel."[1] *St. Cyprian* calls this song, Daniel's,[2] and further, Divine Scripture—"this the Divine Scripture declares, Then those three, it says, as if with one mouth, sung a hymn, and blessed the Lord."[3] *Theodoret* inter-

Mich. The contrary opinion has been ably refuted by Dupin, l. i, c. 6; Montfaucon in Hexap. Orig. c. iii, 8; Hody, &c. Before our Saviour's coming, all the books were translated which form the Catholic Scriptures, but when, we cannot distinctly state.

[1] Adv. Hermog., p. 302. [2] Exhort., Martyr., p. 96.

[3] De Orat. Dom., p. 156.

prets this, as well as the other portions of Daniel, as also does St. Athanasius. The author of the *Synopsis*, believed this to have been written by Daniel: "Daniel. . . .knew the works of God, when he said, All ye works of the Lord, bless the Lord."[1] St. Epiphanius, constantly refers to this hymn, and looks upon it as heaven-inspired."[2] Basil speaks of those "who sung hymns to God from the fiery furnace."[3] St. Ambrose calls this, *a prophetical hymn;*[4] and S. Augustin, who frequently cites the hymn, makes use of it in one place, in order to prove against the Manichees, that all things are good; for as he observes, it is written, that "darkness and light praise the Lord."[5] What Origen's opinion was, the reader has already been told.

History of Susannah, and Bel. I have placed both these histories under the same heading; for in general, the Fathers who cite either of the histories, cite both. The disciple of St. Polycarp, St. Ireneus, distinctly refers to both passages, and calls both the work of Daniel. "Let them listen (he says) to the words of the prophet Daniel, O thou seed of Canaan, and not of Juda, beauty has deceived thee, and lust perverted thy heart." (Dan. xiii, 56.)[6] And "who is like the God of the living, but God who is above all things. . . .The God whom the prophet Daniel proclaimed when the King of Persia asked him, saying, Why dost not thou adore Bel? and he answered and said to him, Because I do not worship idols made with hands, but the living God." (Dan. xiv, 3, 4.)[7] As

[1] Ad Serap., t. i, p. 170.
[2] In Anchor. t. ii, p. 28, 32.
[3] De Spir. Sanc., c. xxx.
[4] Hexæmer., t. i, p. 2.
[5] L. de Nat. Boni. c. xvi.
[6] Adv. Hær., l. iv, c. 44, et passim.
[7] Ibid., l. iv, c. 11.

Tertullian considered the Hymn of the Three Youths to be divine; so, too, did he look upon the two passages, the sacred character of which we are now establishing, as divine. The History of Susannah he admits in his book *on the Soldier;*[8] and that of Bel in his work *on Idolatry*.[9] Origen's letter to Africanus,[10] regarding the History of Susannah, contains, as Eusebius (H. E., l. vi, c. 31) observes, a full defence of the objected passages, and further shews the difficulties which follow from adhering simply to the Hebrew text. And in Hom. i, in Levit. he makes use of the following observations: "But it is now time, that we should apply the words of the holy Susannah against those wicked priests,—words which they indeed reject, casting out of the catalogue of the divine volumes the history of Susannah; but which we receive, and from which we opportunely argue against them."

St. Athanasius calls both passages the work of Daniel: "And in Daniel, Susannah exclaimed with a loud voice, saying, 'O Eternal God, who knowest hidden things, &c.'[11] "Daniel also said to Astyages: 'We do not worship idols made with hands, but the living God'":[12] and so too does St. Cyprian.[13] For further information regarding the authenticity of the history of Susannah, I refer the reader to St. Fulgentius, Quæst. ad Ferrandum, who cites xiii, 42, 45, in proof of the divinity of the Holy Ghost; to St. Chrysostom, who explains this history in two sermons;

[8] De Milite., p. 206. [9] De Idol., p. 174.

[10] See the passage already cited.

[11] Contra Arian. Orat. ii, t. i, p. 319.

[12] Ibid. Orat. iv, p. 483.

[13] Epist. xl, et de Exhort. Martyrii, p. 190.

to St. Hiliary, l. iv, de Trinit.; and to S. Epiphanius, adv. Hæreses., n. 30.

8° Machabees. Origen thus speaks of this last work which we shall have thus specifically to defend: "That we may show, from the authority of Scripture, that these things are so, hear what is said in the book of Machabees, where the mother of seven martyrs exhorts one of her sons to endure torments. 'I beseech thee, my son, look up to heaven.'"[1] St. Cyprian is equally explicit: "The divine Scripture .... admonishes, saying, ... 'fear not the words of the sinful man, for his glory shall be come as dung and worms'"—(1 Macc. ii.);[2] and his work "*de Exhort. Martyrii*," is one continuous citation of, or reference to the *Machabees*. St. Austin informs us, that though the Synagogue did not, the Church does receive the Machabees as canonical—"*Maccabæorum libros non Judæi sed Ecclesia pro canonicis habet.*"[3] These words have been, as we have already seen, adopted by numerous other writers; and they refer to an important fact—a fact to which former and actual belief bears evidence—to wit, the admission of books into the canon, which had not been previously recognised as divine Scripture. The previous non-insertion of some divine writings into the canon, only shews, that at a given period, those works had not been sufficiently evidenced; whilst their admission into the canon, proves, that after the traditions of the Church had been sifted, their real character was fully established,

[1] De Princip. l. ii, c. 1. See too his *Exhortation to Martyrdom*, where he calls the Machabees, previously cited, *Scripture*.

[2] Epist. lv, ad Cornel.

[3] L. xviii, c. 36, de Civitate Dei.

by that authority which God had appointed to guide men into truth, even unto the end of time.

In conclusion, need I tell the well-informed reader of the New Testament, that constant reference is there made to what are called the Apocryphal works? For example, Wisdom vii, 26, is referred to in Hebrews i, 3; and Wisdom xv, 7, in Romans ix, 20, 21; and again, Wisdom xiii, 1, in Romans i, 20; Ecclesiasticus xi, 19, xiv, 18, and xlii, 1, are respectively referred to by St. Luke xii, 19, by St. James i, 2, and St. James ii, 1; and vestiges of the Machabees occur in the Epistle to the Hebrews, &c.

If the reader will bear in mind, what was the belief of particular Churches at first, of Churches, which, owing to circumstances, had been best enabled to test the character of the sacred writings; if further, he will remember how, after the flow of ages, when evidence had been sifted in the most careful manner, the Church dispersed through the world, convinced of the character of the disputed books, admitted them to be sacred and canonical; if again, he will attend to the origin and antiquity of the *Septuagint*, and the *Vetus Itala*, not to refer to numerous other editions of the inspired writings, as well as to the fact of Christ and his Apostles appealing, and distinctly referring to the first-named version, whilst the fathers cited and commented the latter; or if, in fine, he will consider how distinctly the universally recognized inspired Scriptures suppose the inspiration of the deuterocanonical writings, he will readily admit the correctness of the lists of the Scriptures drawn up by the Pontiffs and Bishops already named, and the appropriateness of the definition which was framed by the fathers assembled at Trent, and publicly agreed upon, on the 8th of April, 1546.

From what has been said, it follows: 1° That the canon of the New Testament was not admitted in its entirety from the beginning. 2° That in point of fact it could not have been so admitted, owing to the difficulty which existed of intercommunication, and of obtaining evidence enough of the origin and character of several of the sacred writings. 3° Owing to these difficulties, several writings of the New Testament were not only doubted of, but absolutely repudiated, by several fathers, nay more, by considerable divisions of the Church. 4° These differences were drawn nearly to a close towards the end of the fourth century; Africa, the child of Rome, leading the way to unity. The fathers there bore testimony to the truth, relative to the canon, as also to another dogma, namely, the necessity of recurring to Rome for approval of their decision. *De confirmando isto canone* (the 47th) *Transmarina Ecclesia consulatur*, is the important note appended to the African canon. Rome approved of the decision; for the African canon was well known already, and acknowledged by the See of Peter; and by this see, the information was rapidly communicated to the rest of Christendom. 5° The grounds of the acceptation of the canon were not these; the books *now* acknowledged were always looked upon by all as divine; but this was the basis of the common belief: the Church having examined the question, has agreed that such books are, and such are not divine. Testimony was sifted with all human care; after this, the decision was given, and in this decision God was heard speaking, but speaking through that instrument, which was to convey the truth to all nations and to all times. As long as the Church forbore thus to speak, so long was there hesitation; but after she had

spoken, obedience became a duty, as sacred as religion itself—religion, in fact, was involved in the act of obedience. This last point is one of vast importance, and the reader will do well to recall to mind what the fathers, whose writings have been cited, have said on this head; namely, Origen, in his *Epistle to Africanus;* Cyril of Jerusalem, in his *Fourth Catechetical Instruction;* St. Dionysius of Alexandria, and Eusebius, H. E. l. iii, c. 35, and l. vii, c. 25; and St. Austin, *De doctr. Christianâ,* l. ii, n. 12. From the Church, and the Church only, do they affect even to derive the Scriptures; without this authority they would have either doubted of, or as St. Austin says, have actually repudiated them.[1]

The sixth Article of Anglicanism is clearly absurd, when examined critically. Protestants accept the canon of the New Testament *on authority;* and in this they trust implicitly. But admitting Church authority—a living authority—for individuals do not analyse, do not examine each link in the chain of authority—in respect to one portion of the canon, how can they reject it in reference to another—to the canon of the Old Testament. Is the Church only truthful in respect of a part of the inspired word? The fathers did not think so. They assert that therefore they admitted Tobias and Machabees, Ecclesiasticus and Wisdom, and the Gospels themselves to be divine writings, because they were recognized as such, by the Church. Let the reader remember the

[1] When the decision of Trent was promulgated, those who had previously entertained opinions somewhat at variance with that decision, at once yielded assent, on the very grounds just established.

words of St. Augustine, "Ego vero Evangelio non crederem, nisi me Ecclesiæ Catholicæ commoveret auctoritas," as also his other strong expression regarding the book of Machabees; let him further call to mind the language of Origen, Jerome, and the catechetical addresses of St. Cyril of Jerusalem—their language is a fair representation of the opinions of those distinguished prelates who preceded, as well as of those who succeeded them,—and it will be impossible to entertain a moment's doubt on this head.

On what grounds, do Protestants receive some books of the Old Testament, and reject others? This matter is deserving of an attentive consideration. If it can be shown that all is uncertainty, on their own principles, in reference to even the protocanonical works, and that every argument favours and proves the *Catholic* canon, which establishes the authority of several of the books of the Old and New Law, it will be admitted by all believers in the written word, that the Protestant canon is essentially and radically defective, and as such must be corrected by the decisions of the fathers of Trent. Now all this can be shown to demonstration.

1° We are *completely ignorant* of the extent of the first canon of the Jews, as also of the grounds on which this canon was formed. That the first canon of the Jews consisted of the Pentateuch only, is a received opinion; but the belief is merely conjectural, based on statements of doubtful certainty, and on a fact which proves absolutely nothing:—namely, that the books of the law were, and are alone, received by the Samaritans. Nor is another supposition, notwithstanding its general admission, better supported by evidence. It is nearly taken as granted

by writers of this age, as well as of former times, that a catalogue of the sacred books was drawn up by Esdras, soon after the Babylonian captivity; though on this point ancient authority is sadly scanty. Much less positive, however, are the particulars regarding the mode or the circumstances of the formation of the Esdrine canon. Some suppose that the sacred books were lost during the years of trouble and distress which the Jews had to endure, and that to Esdras, during the space of forty days—the analogy intended is obvious—God again communicated the law. Though many great names, both ancient[1] and modern, might be cited in advocacy of this inspiration, there is no proof whatever of its truth: at the best, it appears to be based on no higher authority than that of the fourteenth chapter of the so-called Fourth book of Esdras—a work which Catholics and Anglicans equally reject—whilst it would seem to be distinctly contradicted by the author of the Machabees,[2] who is the first to inform us of the attempt made during the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, to destroy the sacred records: and Prideaux[3] has adduced strong proofs of the zeal of Josias to preserve the sacred writings by transcription.

Others, despairing of establishing this first opinion, which advocated such an extent of destruction and of inspiration, have adopted another theory: it is this. Esdras, according to them, collected together and collated

[1] S. Irenæus Adv. Hær. l. iii, c. 21; Tertull. de Habitu Mulieris, c. iii; Clement of Alex. l. i, Strom.; S. Basil, Epist. xlii.

[2] 1 Macc. i, 59, 60; see too 4 Kings xxii, 8, and 2 Paral. xxxiv, 14. The sacred Scriptures were in the temple obviously in the time of Helcias.

[3] History of the Jews, part i, b. v.

the existing copies of sacred Scripture, and eventually informed the Jews *which* were the sacred writings to be admitted. They further assure us, that from him we derive the triple division of the sacred Scriptures into the *Law*, the *Prophets*, and the *Ketubim* or *Hagiographa;* and that by him were added those chapters or portions of chapters which were required for the completion of certain books—such as Genesis xii, 6, xxii, 24; Exodus xvi, 35, 36; Deut. ii, 12, iii, 14, and the last chapter of this book; Proverbs xxv, i, &c.[2] Nay more, we are seriously told that Esdras substituted the Chaldaic for the Hebrew character, and modernized throughout the names of places; and as if this was not a task sufficiently onerous for one man, to him they ascribe the introduction of the vowel points. One thing, however, is wanting, unfortunately, to the perfection of this system: *the semblance of a proof.*[3] Proofs being wanting, I shall not, as I should have otherwise done, show that even under such a system, no Protestant can rest satisfied, on his own principles: for even if Esdras had been all, and more than all, that he has been represented to be by his admirers, we have yet to see, how the Jews *had evidence* of his character, and *on what grounds* they assented to his declarations relative to the inspiration and incorruption of those writings, which, down to the period of Esdras, had not been considered

[2] Even Prideaux assigns some of the above passages to Esdras; whilst others ascribe them to Simon the Just, &c. &c. *Chacun à son gout*, is the rule here, as in other things.

[3] For a very lengthened, able, and truly eloquent exposition of the various systems connected with this subject, I refer the reader to my learned Brother's work, entitled, "An Examination of the Distinctive Principle of Protestantism," pp. 57-8, &c.

as canonical. What evidence did Esdras receive from the Jews; and how did he proceed in the examination of that evidence? Was it half as great in favour of the new canon then received, as was adduced in proof of the canon approved of in 397? and was *Esdras* as clearly designated by heaven, to be *the means* of arriving at the knowledge of a great dogmatical truth, as was *the Church* which has sealed the sacred canon, but which Protestants dare to deny and to oppose. But let this pass; for as yet no one proof has been given of the origin of the canon of the Old Law, of or its extent, at the period to which I have hitherto had occasion to refer.

But the difficulty does not end with the name of Esdras. Let us allow that Esdras did, and authoritatively too, edit the sacred canon, we have still to learn who appended those books and passages of books, which appeared after the demise of Esdras. For example, in Nehemiah and the Paralipomena, there are genealogies brought down *at least* to the days of Alexander the Great and Darius Codomannus; and further, there seems to be internal evidence in the prophecy of Malachias to show, and this is admitted by Gray[4] and others, that this inspired writer lived after Esdras. By what authority was this book, as well as the books of Esdras, and the additions just referred to, added to the canon? Was it by virtue of some declaration of the great Jewish council; or was it in consequence of some individual's authority? Let the answer

[4] Compare Gray's account of the times of Ezra and Malachias, in his work on the *Old Testament*, Cf. pp. 208 and 507. St. Jerome makes Malachias contemporary with Darius Hystaspes, Præf. in xii, Prophetas. Consult also the Encyclopædia Britann. article *Bible*.

be what it may, this will be clear, that the canon might be, and was enlarged; and further, that it was enlarged by those of whom Protestants know absolutely nothing! What prevented its after enlargement, if sacred volumes were written, and evidence was offered in their favour, as great at least as could be adduced in favour of Esdras or of Malachias.

2° That a fixed and well-known canon did exist among the Jews of Palestine, at the time of our blessed Saviour, is clear; for we find that they all received the same books, a coincidence which could not be the effect of mere chance or of individual research. These books are *said* to be twenty-two in number, but in fact they were thirty-nine in all. For what reason, we know not, but it is a fact, that it was the wish of the Jewish writers to confine the nominal amount of the sacred books to the number of the letters in the Hebrew alphabet, which, as I have already insinuated, is twenty-two. Hence, it was requisite to reckon *several* books as *one*. This custom was afterwards very generally followed by the fathers of the Church, when speaking of the older canon; and hence, however much they may differ in their divisions and subdivisions of the thirty-nine books, the gross amount is ordinarily found to be the same, twenty-two.

3° It is not equally easy to assign the exact number of the books which formed the canon of the Hellenistic Jews, who dwelt in Egypt in the time of the Ptolemies, and for whom was framed the venerable version in Greek, by the seventy-two scholars sent to Alexandria by the Jewish high-priest. On the banks of the Nile flourished an enormous Jewish population. Thence colonies passed

to Rome and the cities of the Mediterranean, and to them, in course of time, was given the grace of Christianity. Their version contained all the books of the Catholic canon, and to the nature of them, they were to bear evidence everywhere. They would, indeed, state which were canonical and which only sacred, which had already been decreed to be divine, and which still were in need of this decision: and thus the seed of orthodoxy was sown, of which the Church in good time reaped the fruit. That there were some books of venerable character but of doubtful inspiration among the Jews, as afterwards there were among the Christians, books whose divine character could only be admitted after a careful examination, and on the declaration of some competent authority, is easily proved by the following testimony of Josephus.

"We have not an innumerable multitude of books among us, disagreeing from and contradicting one another (as the Greeks have), but only twenty-two books, which contain the records of all time, and are justly believed to be divine. And of them, five belong to Moses, which contain his laws and the tradition of the origin of mankind till his death: this time was a little short of three thousand years. But as to the time from the death of Moses till the reign of Artaxerxes, King of Persia, who reigned after Xerxes, the prophets who were after Moses wrote down what was done in their times in thirteen books. The remaining four books contain hymns to God, and precepts for the conduct of human life.

"It is true our history has been written since Artaxerxes very particularly, but has not been esteemed of the like authority with the former by our forefathers, because

there has not been an exact succession of prophets since that time. And how firmly we have given credit to these books of our own nation, is evident by what we do; for during so many ages as have already passed, no one has been so bold as either to add anything to them, to take anything from them, or to make any change in them; but it is become natural to all Jews, immediately and from their very birth, to esteem these books to contain divine doctrines, and to persist in them, and if occasion be, willingly to die for them, &c." [1]

From this testimony then it appears, 1° That the Jews were in possession of several venerable writings, of which the character was not adequately known; 2° That it was believed that these works might, under some circumstances, be entitled to greater veneration, when their authenticity and sacred nature had been still further demonstrated; and 3° That the proof of their authenticity and sacredness was derivable from the testification of some of the prophetical line. Here, then, are all the elements, required by us, for a definition, and an addition to the canon. There are venerable writings, writings allowed to be at least sacred; and these are kept with the greatest care, and handed down from age to age as venerable, and possibly divine. When Christ comes, *the prophet* indeed appears, who can pronounce on the nature of these writings; and that he did speak, and his Apostles after him, is evidenced at first, by the assent of the individual pastors of the Church whose testimonies we have adduced, and afterwards by the declaration of the Church, which is "*the*

[1] Josephus, l. i, c. Appionem, Whiston's translation; Cf. Antiq. Jud. l. xi, c. vi, s. 13.

pillar and foundation of truth," and with which Christ and the Spirit of Truth, uninterruptedly abide. Josephus adopts that same tone and those very expressions which the ecclesiastical writers make use of, as the reader has seen, in reference to some books of the New Testament. Whilst some are emphatically called Scripture, others are handed down as doubtful; and of these it is said, that their extrinsic character is widely different from those universally received; and such an expression, whether used by Josephus or by the fathers, was the only orthodox phrase to be used. Age follows age, and as time flows on, we see the tradition in favour of the divinity of the disputed works strengthening, and at last, a world believes as certain what was once doubtful, and reverences as divine what had been previously only considered *venerable.* Compare the language of Josephus and of the fathers; examine the means referred to by each, as required for the attainment of a full knowledge of the fact of the number of the works entitled to be considered Scripture, and it will be seen, that in language and all particulars, they are exactly similar: that it is impossible to admit the New Testament canon without admitting the Old, as approved of at Carthage and afterwards at Trent; and that all objections against the latter tend to cast more than a doubt upon even the twenty-two books of the original Jewish canon.

It is deserving of remark, that Josephus no where mentions *which* are the books which were received when he wrote. All that we can learn from him is this: that the books of Moses were five in number; that there were thirteen in the second class of Scripture, and four only in

the third; but the names of the books are no where given. We may *presume* that he admitted the books which the Articles seem to look upon as the old Jewish canon: but this assumption is devoid of proof. Indeed, as Cardinal Perron has proved long ago, Josephus no where refers to the book of Job; and there is nothing to prevent us from believing, that all the sapiential books of the seventy may have been included under the following description of the writings of the favoured king Solomon: "He composed fifteen hundred books of odes and poems, three thousand books of parables and similies; he wrote the history of plants, and also of cattle and beasts of the earth, water fowl and the birds of the air."—L. viii, Antiq., p. 202.

These observations adequately answer the object of this somewhat lengthened investigation of the nature and number of the sacred books, and of the means adopted both by Jews and Christians to discover which were divine writings, and which merely human compositions. I will, however, before quitting this important subject, direct the reader's attention to the reference made in the Articles to the authority of S. Jerome, and to the constant statement of modern and more ancient writers relative to the catalogues which some of the Fathers of the Church drew up at various times, of the sacred volumes. I shall not indeed say much on either point; for as to the latter it has been shown in detail what opinions the fathers held on the disputed books of the Jewish and Christian canon; and an answer has in fact been already supplied to the remarks made on, and the inferences drawn from, the words of S. Jerome by the compilers of the Elizabethan Articles. After citing what Catholics call the proto-

canonical works of the Old Testament, the writers of the sixth Article thus continue: "The other books (as Hierom saith) the Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners; but yet it doth not apply them to establish any doctrine. Such are these following: The third book of Esdras, the fourth book of Esdras, the book of Tobias, the book of Judith, the rest of the book of Esther, the book of Wisdom, Jesus the son of Syrach, Baruch the Prophet, the Song of the three children, the history of Susannah, of Bel and the Dragon, the prayer of Manasses, the first book of Maccabees, the second book of Maccabees." Now what inference would the framers and the imposers of the Articles wish the public to draw from the words of S. Jerome? This: that because at *one* time certain works were not received as canonical, therefore such works could not be at any after period admitted as canonical. Let the reader test this conclusion in this way; let him state that according to S. Jerome the East rejected the Apocalypse, and the West the Epistle of S. Paul to the Hebrews, in the middle of the fourth century, and thence infer the non-canonicity of these two books in any after age, and what will be said? That this conclusion is fair? No, that it is unfair? Then let the objectors solve their prior argument, and reject their own conclusions, for if this conclusion relative to the books of the New Testament be illogical, assuredly the inference drawn from a similar premiss regarding the Old Testament cannot be logical. The most that can be deduced from this statement of S. Jerome is this, that until certain books were proved to be inspired, such works could not be cited as conclusive authority in favor of any dogmatical question

dependent on that authority. This statement is too plain to be denied. But the question to be settled is this; can works of questionable inspiration at one period, and consequently of possibly questionable authority, eventually be looked upon as certainly divine, and absolutely true? That the Fathers of the Church thought they could, is plain from what has been already stated. Cyril and Origen, Ambrose and Augustine, and afterwards provincial, national, and œcumenical Councils, asserted and openly this proposition; and admitted as divine, writings which at a former period had been doubted of, and even partially denied, according to their own shewing. But was St. Jerome, too, of this same opinion? Assuredly he was; for in his observations on St. James' Epistle he makes use of the following language. "James wrote but one Epistle which is one of the seven Catholic Epistles; which too, is said to have been published by another in his name, *but has, gradually, in process of time, acquired authority.*"[1] And his observations bearing on this point are even more conclusive in his remarks on the Epistle of St. Jude. "Jude has left a short Epistle, which, because of a quotation from an apocryphal book of Enoch, *is rejected by many;* however *it has, by length of time and custom obtained authority, and is reckoned amongst the Holy Scriptures.*"[2] Whatever may have been the earlier opinions of St. Jerome in regard of several of the deutero-canonical writings, it would seem that in his later years he adopted the common belief relative to the canon of sacred Scripture. Assuredly he,[3] who stated what is mentioned

[1] De V. I. c. ii. [2] De V. I. c. iv.

[3] Præf, in lib. Sal.

in the book of Homilies, did not hesitate eventually either to entitle the books of Wisdom,[4] Ecclesiasticus,[5] and Machabees,[6] *divine Scripture*, or *Scripture*, or to appeal to them in *proof of those dogmas which he was anxious to establish*. These observations will enable the reader to form a more correct notion of St. Jerome's opinions than could have been derived from the mere words of the sixth Article.

If we turn from St. Jerome to the catalogues of the sacred writings framed during the earlier ages of Christianity, we shall feel equally convinced of the futility of the statement made by Protestants, that the canon of the Anglican Church is identical with that of primitive Catholicism. 1° Melito, whose object it was simply to state which were the works *universally* admitted,[7] omits altogether the books of *Esther* and *Nehemias*. 2° Though *Origen* presents to us a catalogue of the Jewish books, he at the same time, as we have already seen, strenuously maintains the divinity of other books and parts of books, which were rejected by the Jews.[8] 3° The Fathers at the Council of Laodicea, admit *Baruch* and make no mention of the Apocalypse. 4° St. Cyril of Jerusalem includes Baruch and excludes the Apocalypse. 5° St. Gregory of Nazianzum omits, like Melito, Esther from his list. 6° The author of the Synopsis likewise *omits Esther*, whilst he admits Baruch. 7° *Epiphanius* receives Baruch. 8° *The Apostolical Canons* enumerate Judith, three books of

[4] Comm. in Hier. c. xviii, t. ii, p. 587.

[5] Epist. xxxiii, ad Julian. [6] Comm. in Isai. c. xxii, t. ii, p. 131.

[7] See Eusebius, H. E. l. iv, c. 26.

[8] See his Epistle to Africanus already cited.

Machabees, with the addition of the Wisdom of Sirach for the younger people.

The reader will not fail to remember the proofs already given in detail, of these discrepancies. To sum all up in one word: Melito, and the Council of Laodicea, and the Apostolical Constitutions, and Origen, Epiphanius, and St. Gregory of Nazianzum, present to us catalogues all differing from that which the Anglican system, and the fautors of Anglicanism,[1] assume to be truly divine. And since, it is customary with modern writers to state that the divinity of the Protestant Canon of the Old Testament is established by constant references in the New Testament to the inspired writers of the former Law, it may be as well to observe, that there are at least eleven of the protocanonical writings to which such an assertion is inapplicable; for neither Judges, nor Ruth, nor the Paralipomena, nor Esdras, nor Esther, nor Ecclesiastes, nor the Song of Songs, nor Abdias, nor Sophonias, nor the first or fourth book of Kings are once referred to, throughout the entire of the New Testament; whilst several of the deuterocanonical writings *are* not indistinctly referred to, as the reader has already seen.

From what has been said, it follows: 1° That the Protestant canon has no support from antiquity, as a fair representation of the belief of the Christian Church of the number of the sacred writings. 2° That it is in direct opposition to all the opinions entertained by the Fathers, whether we consider them individually, or as representa-

[1] See the unscholarlike observations of Burnet and Pretyman, on the Sixth Article. It really appears wonderful to me, how *such* writers could have *ever* obtained a reputation among even their own party; for their writings are full of inaccuracies and palpable misstatements.

tives of the various sections of the Church of which they were the leaders and distinguished guides. 3° That the principles, advocated in all former ages, justify the present canon of the Catholic Church—for the Fathers readily accepted as divine whatever consentient testimony evidenced to be such; and 4° That the only way of arriving at certainty in a matter of this importance, is an unhesitating reliance on that teaching authority, which Christ himself established, and blessed, and secured against error, in order that men might believe and no longer "be tossed about by every wind of doctrine."

Chapter the Ninth.

The Solibiblical principle—its difficulties and contradictions.

CONTENTS.

The Solibiblical principle false—opposed to the teaching of Christ, his Apostles, and the Church of all ages, and in direct opposition to the antisymbolical origin and character of the Sacred writings.—Mode of acting of Christ, the Apostles, and the Church.—How many Apostles wrote, and why they wrote.—The generative principle of faith in the Apostolic and after times.—Testimonies of the Fathers on this head. The Solibiblical principle unavailable for more than 1400 years.—The Scriptures decide nothing about their own meaning—this evidenced by the Sects which pretend to believe the Bible.—Selden's observations and Henry the Eighth's restrictions.—The Scripture full of difficulties—cause of this.—Proposed limitation of this principle.—Useless as a principle of faith and unjust in Anglicanism.—Examination of the texts ordinarily adduced in favour of the Bible being the only "*Rule of Faith.*"—The Biblical system justly opposed by Catholics.—It is irreconcilable too with numerous tenets believed in by the English Church.—Instances in proof.—Motives of the adherence of Catholics to the authority of the Church.

What St. Hilary observes with regard to the Scriptures is very true: "*Apices sine crimine sunt, sensus in crimine.*"[1] The original text is true; but can as much be

[1] L. ii, de Trinit.

said of the interpretations of this text? If ever there was a document, or a code of laws, variously explained, such a document and such a code, is that commonly called the Sacred Scripture. Every country boasts of its commentators, and though the number of these is *legion*, we are far from being justified in adopting the conclusion that the line of interpreters has ceased. Indeed, if we may be allowed to form an opinion on this head, we should say, judging from the publications which at present inundate Germany, America, and our own country, that the days of biblical criticism are only really beginning: manuscripts, travels, archœological researches, and railroads,[2] not to speak of the results of private talent and study, all offering their quota of information, and egging on numbers to publish results which are calculated to sink into insignificance the writings of Luther and Calvin, of Beza and Zuingli, of Capellus, Simon, Bos, Reland, Michaelis, Scheuchzer, Rosenmuller, and of hundreds of others whose names are familiar in England to the biblical reader; for I deem it unnecessary to name such writers as Whitby, Brown, Clarke, D'Oyly and Mant, and Blomfield, Burton, and Trollope.

Notwithstanding the multitudinous writings which have treated on the Scriptures, and the avowals of scholars, that the sacred volumes are full of difficulties,[3] difficulties which can only be critically surmounted by the possession of such an amount of knowledge, of languages, history, and ancient

[2] The Papers of the other day inform us that the burial place of Daniel has just been discovered.

[3] Even from the statements of *Horne* and *Carpenter*, in their introductory works on the Scripture, it is plain that great acquirements are necessary for a knowledge of the sacred writings.

usages, as few indeed either do or can possess ;—notwithstanding the contradictory conclusions both with regard to mere facts and to dogma which ancient and modern writers have drawn and still do draw from the unexplained letter ; notwithstanding the antagonistic sects which have sprung up from this diversity of comment,—sects which are the practical evidences of the difficulties which are contained in the sacred word,—it is still stated, and this is a first principle, an indisputable truth with all modern separatists that *the Bible is the only rule of faith,* and that nothing is to be received as divine truth which cannot thence be proved. "The Bible and the Bible only," this is the Protestant battle cry ; this is the word uttered when an onslaught is to be made on Catholicity, and with this word the enemies of Rome hope to confound the Catholic. Because the latter will not admit this principle—because he has recourse to an authority for the meaning of the text as well as for the text itself, therefore is he insulted: he is held up as afraid of being tried by God's word ; and his creed is denounced as a human figment and man's tradition ! He is looked upon and pointed at as an enemy of the Bible :—and on this account both his creed and himself are despised. The Catholic, however learned, talented or good, forfeits his caste in society, because he will not adopt the principle of division and call it the principle of unity, and allow that to be the means of arriving at faith, which experience proves to be the basis of every conceivable kind of heresy. Mine will be the task to expose the incorrectness, and indeed palpable absurdity of the Protestant idea, in the remainder of this chapter.

1° It has been already shown in chapter ii, what was the original constitution of the Church, and what the sys-

tem of religious polity prescribed by the Divine Founder of Christianity. The Church was established for ever; its doctrines were for ever to be propagated and perpetuated; and this propagation was a task consigned to the ministerial line, of which the first links were the Apostles. This teaching body was invested by Christ with his own prerogatives. To it was given the Spirit of truth; to it was promised infallibility and ceaseless perpetuity, and with it Christ was ever to be—the founder and the perpetuator of the heavenly system. To the second chapter, in which what I have already briefly stated is distinctly proved, I again remit the reader. Teaching, was the mode appointed for the preservation of truth; and hence the Apostles so emphatically say: "Faith cometh through *hearing*, and hearing through the word of God."[1] "Remember your Prelates who have *spoken* the word of God to you." And, "Dearly beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits, if they be of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world. He that knoweth God, *heareth* us. He that is *not of God, heareth us not.* By *this* we know the spirit of truth, and the spirit of error."[3] At the bidding of Christ,[4] the Apostles went forth *and taught* the nations; they *preached* to Jews and to Gentiles, and the sound of their words was echoed throughout the world. Nor were their endeavours unblessed. Thousands were converted as St. Peter *spoke;* and the other Apostles were the instruments of salvation to Parthians, and Indians, and Ethiopians; to the inhabi-

[1] Romans x, 17. [2] Heb. xiii, 7.
[3] 1 John iv, 1, 6. [4] Matt. xxviii, 18, 20.

tants of Greece, and to those subject to the Roman Emperors,[1] as they *preached* the divine word.

So little did the Apostles believe in the Protestant system, that few of them—only five—wrote a single line of Scripture; seventeen out of the twenty-seven books which form the New Testament being the compositions of men, who were not members of the Apostolic College. And is there a word in their writings, expressive either of the discontinuance of the system of teaching, by means of which Christianity had been so successfully propagated, or of an intention to commit to paper the entire doctrinal code, committed to them by Jesus Christ for the purpose of thus spreading far and wide among Jews and Infidels, the knowledge of Christianity. If the sacred writers record how Christ proceeded in the work of converting, and by what means Apostles propagated Christianity, they inform us that Jesus Christ taught, and that Apostles taught, and that this mode of spreading the faith was to be unvarying; they tell us, in a word, that the Apostles and their successors were to preach and teach—preach and teach as the representatives of Christ—that mankind was bound to hear and obey this divinely appointed line, and that thus and thus only was religion to be perpetuated. Ere Apostles die, they bid others perform faithfully the task of preaching committed to them; to others, they impart the form of sound words to be communicated

[1] See on the Apostolic Wanderings and Labours, Zaccaria's Dissert., vol. iii; as also Neander's "Planting of the Churches." By referring to this German writer, I would not have it thought that I by any means approve of his theory. This I utterly repudiate. I refer to him as a man of considerable information.

fearlessly, and under every kind of circumstance; and if reference be made to the cause of the appointment of ministers, the cause assigned will be this: "That henceforth we be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the wickedness of men, by cunning craftiness, by which they lie in wait to deceive."[2] These statements exactly correspond with the fact of the original propagation of Christianity; they confirm a truth already pre-existing and well known —how, the reader has already seen.[3] These positions, then, prove that not by writings, not by private inferences and deductions from writings, was Christianity to be spread and believed in: it was to be spread by the teaching of the ministry, and to the end of time this declaration was to be true—"*faith cometh through hearing;*" and not as Protestants will have it, through *seeing*, and through merely individual research. Man was to be *taught religion*, in the same way as he was to be taught any other branch of knowledge, but with this difference: whilst other teachers communicate information in reference to merely human sciences, the Apostolic line is to communicate inspired truth; and whilst others, even as a body, may go astray in their advocacy of literary or scientific pursuits, the successors of the Apostles are secured against the possibility of such deflections from truth, whilst enunciating the doctrinal and moral code of our Divine Saviour.

To the careful reader, the words made use of by Christ, when he commissioned his Apostles to go forth and teach, will of themselves appear perfectly conclusive against the Protestant supposition. These words regarded all teachers;

[2] See Eph. iv, 11, 14.

[3] In chapter ii.

the duties of the ministry were distinctly fixed; and the Apostles, who owed their position to Christ, had *no power* whatsoever to alter his appointment. If it be further remembered, that as a matter of fact, *all the Apostles did preach*, whilst only five wrote; and that those who did write, acknowledge the commission and command to preach and to teach, without once stating that they had a command to commit a line to paper, in reference to dogma,[1] our observations will appear more and more conclusive, in respect to the matter in hand.

And from the character of the sacred writings, and the times in which they appeared, equally conclusive evidence may be derived of their anti-symbolical and anti-articular nature. The *Acts of the Apostles*, for example, were published in order that *the Christians* might have a faithful record of what took place in the Church after the ascension of Christ, especially in the persons of St. Peter and St. Paul; and a similar motive induced St. Luke to record what he had heard from faithful witnesses relative to the sayings and doings of Jesus Christ. St. Luke writes simply, as far as his intentions were concerned,

[1] I have here guarded myself against all cavil, by the words, *in reference to dogma*. The Apocalypse, alone seems to refer to a command; but then this is rather a prophetical than a doctrinal work. As is clear too, even *a command to write*, would in no way militate with the original command to teach orally the doctrines of Christianity. The two commands are widely disparate in character. From the command to write, it would be unfair to infer either that all was written which Jesus Christ had revealed, or that if all had been written, each individual was enabled and obliged to interpret the writings for himself, and thence to derive a fixed and unerring code of belief. I have made this plain observation, in consequence of the unscholarlike cavil of Palmer. See his "Church of Christ," vol. ii, p. 3; c. i, Obj. 3, p. 18.

as a faithful historian. He writes too, not to teach any person, much less the world at large, the faith, but he writes *to believers*, in order that they may have a faithful history of previous events. Numbers were engaged in writing spurious and false records:[2] these St. Luke had heard of; and wishing to supply the believer with correct information relative to the Saviour and his Apostles, he determined on writing his two important works, the Gospel which bears his name, and the Acts of the Apostles. Obviously, however, he writes, as I have observed, to and for *believers; to* and *for*, in a word, *those who already professed the divine law of Jesus Christ, in consequence of the Apostolic teaching*, and not for those who either re-

[2] The number of apocryphal works written in the early ages is truly surprising. We have the *Letter of Christ to Abgarus*, King of Edessa, Euseb. H. E., l. i, c. 13; and another directed to a priest named Leopas, in the city of Eris; *a Gospel of the Infancy of Jesus; the Proto-Evangelium of St. James; the Gospel of Nicodemus; the Six Epistles of St. Paul to Seneca;* the Acts and Gospel of St. Andrew, *Eusebius, H. E.*, l. iii, c. 25; *Epiphanius hær.* xlvii and lxi, and *Gelasius in Dec.;* the Gospel of the Twelve Apostles, *Origen, Comm. in Luc.;* the Gospel of Barnabas, *Gelasius in L.;* the writings of St. Bartholomew, *Pseudo-Dion. de Theol. Myst. Gelas., l. c.;* the Gospel according to the Egyptians, *Clem. Alex.* l. iii, *Strom., Hierom. Præf in Matth., Epiph. hær.* xlii, n. 2; the Gospel of Eve, *Epiph. hær.* xxvi, n. 2; the Gospel to the Hebrews, *Euseb. H. E.*, l. iv, c. 22; the Gospel of Jude, *Epiph hær.* xxxviii; of Judas Iscariot, *Iren. adv. hær.* l. i, c. 35; of Matthias, *Euseb. H. E.* l. iii, c. 25; and of Marcion, *Tertull. adv. Marcion*, l. iv, c. 2; the Gospel of Perfection, *Epiph. Hær.* xxvi; of the Scythians, *idem. hær.* lxvi; of Thaddæus, Tatian, Valentinus, and of Truth, *Irenæus adv. hær.* l. iii. Besides these, we have the Acts of St. John; those used by the Manichæans; the Acts of Paul and Thecla, besides several other writings circulated under the name of St. Paul; not to mention numerous other works honoured with the name of Sacred Scripture. The curious reader may satisfy himself on this interesting subject, by consulting the second volume of Jones' learned work on the Sacred Scriptures.

jected Christ or had not heard of him. A similar observation is applicable to the Gospel of St. Matthew and St. Mark. Under peculiar circumstances, and for the purpose of gratifying certain parties, each of these Evangelists penned his Gospel, as we are informed by Eusebius. Passages out of the writings of this Father of ecclesiastical history, in proof of this assertion, have been already presented before the reader. Nor is a very dissimilar origin to be assigned to the Gospel of St. John. At the request of those *who were already Christians*, and in consequence of accidental circumstances, he was induced to pen his Gospel. Eusebius (H. E., l. iii, 24, and vi, 14) informs us, and the statement is confirmed by St. Jerome's authority, (De Scrip. Eccles., et Præf. in Matth.) that *the Bishops as well as the faithful of Asia* earnestly entreated John to write down what he had so often taught them by word of mouth. The former author likewise says, that the beloved disciple having discovered many omissions of important events preceding and subsequent to the imprisonment of the Baptist, in the writings of the other Evangelists, wrote his Gospel as a kind of supplementary volume to the three Gospels which had been previously published, and more or less circulated. Another reason is assigned for the writing. Already had several heresiarchs arisen,[1] who had even dared to attack the divinity of our Lord. Among these early enemies of the divinity were Cerinthus, and Ebion, and the Nicoläites. These St. John undertook to confound; and in the most sublime and energetic language, he solidly established the divinity of the *Word*. If, again, we turn to the Epistles, we shall still more clearly see that their origin seems accidental,

[1] Iren. adv. hær. l. iii, to 11.

occasioned by individual wants, or local circumstances; and that there is nothing to shew that the writers looked upon themselves as either tracing out the full doctrinal code of Christianity, or providing records which were to guide the Church in all after ages. For example, the Corinthians were guilty of breaches of charity; and among them there was a convert who had dared to sin even with his father's wife. St. Paul writes an Epistle to condemn both the general uncharitableness, and the incestuous union. Does St. Paul leave another in Crete, to govern the infant Church there established? He writes, in his anxiety for its welfare, a letter of instruction, full of wise and important suggestions. A servant leaves his master, and St. Paul sends him back, with a letter supplicatory of pardon. Enemies rise up against the Church, and St. Jude writes a hortatory Epistle to the Christians, in order to encourage them to perseverance in the faith which they had received. In fine, St. John had heard with delight of the kindness which Gaius had shown towards the Christians, and the result is a congratulatory letter, full of expressions of regard and thankfulness. To sum up these observations in one sentence: the Epistles were, in their origin, rather of personal and local, than general and Catholic interest; they were written for the benefit of the believer, and not for the conversion of the the infidel. They are, abstracting from their inspiration, exactly such letters as our prelates write at the present hour, and have written in every age, *to the faithful*, especially to the charitable and virtuous, or the unkind and faulty individuals, committed to their care.

We have already had occasion to notice two facts utterly at variance with the Protestant belief relative to the soli-

biblical system; of which the first is this: *the canon of Scripture was not fixed till the close of the fourth century in any considerable portion of the Church.* If the books of Scripture were actually unauthorized, how could the members of the Church either have derived their religion from them, or have believed that they were the divinely constituted means, for discovering and propagating the one system of faith. And yet, the reader will not fail to remember, that the four first centuries are called emphatically, by Protestants, the ages of faith, the period of doctrinal purity; they are the ages which, they say, they are willing to follow in matters of doctrine. I lay no emphasis on this latter assertion, for it is notorious that Grabe, and numbers of others who have given their attention to the teachings of the fathers, admit that the Mass was looked upon as a sacrifice, that the saints were invoked, and the dead prayed for, from the earliest period —though Anglicanism rejects these doctrines and practices of Catholicity; but I draw the reader's attention to the admitted orthodoxy of the first ages, in order that he may see that religion flourished before the Protestant principle was even possibly true, before the Bible could be a rule to faith; and that if it must be admitted that the world did eventually abandon the truth, as utterly and entirely as the framers of the Homilies believed, or affected to believe, this admission regards a period posterior to the settlement of the canon of the Scripture, when, owing to the altered circumstances of the times, agreement on this head, had become more feasible than it had been previously. Having treated this matter fully, I shall at once proceed to the second fact referred to. The fathers admitted, *on the authority of the Church*, the Gospels, as well as the other portions of Holy Writ. St. Austin

positively affirms this to be true in his own regard, and that he was not singular is clear, from the writings of Cyril and Jerome, and of numerous other writers whose opinions have been already adduced. Thus the *Church* was held up as the pillar and support of truth. To her even the most learned were indebted for the very letter of Scripture; and receiving from her, without limitation or restriction, what they were to consider to be the written word, can it be supposed that they would eventually question her authority, reject her teaching, and declare that she had erred, and constitute themselves the judges of doctrine and morality? This, Anglicanism and Anglicans did and do; but did the fathers do so? No: and in proof of this, it were easy indeed to adduce volumes of evidence. They looked upon the Church as *the expounder*, as well as *the preserver*, of the text. In fact, taught Christianity before the sacred pages were put into their hands, they already believed, in virtue of the teaching of the Church, before they knew a line of Scripture: and the faith which they had received, served them as a guide in all their explanations and developments of the meaning of the written word. "Where the gifts of God are placed," says St. Irenæus, "there we ought to learn the truth (from those), with whom is that succession of the Church, which is from the Apostles, and that which is sound and irreproveable in conversation, and unadulterated and incorruptible in discourse, abides. For they both guard that faith of ours in one God, who made all things....and they expound the Scriptures to us without danger, neither uttering blasphemy against God, nor dishonouring the patriarchs, nor contemning the prophets."—*Adv. Hær.* l. iv, c. 26.

Tertullian's work *On Prescriptions*, turns completely

on this: that those only have a right to appeal to the Scriptures, who admit the Church's authority. "The Scriptural contest," he says, "is of no avail, except to turn either the stomach or the brain. That heresy receives not certain Scriptures, and if it receives some, it draws them to its own purpose by additions and subtractions; .... and if it receives in some way the whole Scriptures, it nevertheless depraves them by diverse expositions. The spurious sense is as great an obstacle to truth as the corrupted text. What wilt thou gain, thou must be skilled in the Scriptures, when that which thou doest defend is denied, and when, on the other hand, that which thou doest deny, is defended. Thou shalt indeed lose nothing but thy voice in the contest, nor shalt thou gain anything but anger from the blasphemy. Therefore there must be no appeal to the Scriptures, nor must the contest depend on those things in which the victory is none, or uncertain, or at the best doubtful. For even though the debate on the Scriptures should not so turn out as to confirm each party, the order of things required that this question should be first proposed, which is now the only one to be discussed, '*to whom belongs the very faith; whose are the Scriptures; by whom, and through whom, and when, and to whom, was that rule delivered whereby men become Christians;*' for wherever both the true Christian rule and faith shall be shown to be, there will be the true Scriptures and the true expositions, and all the true Christian traditions..... Should it chance that the truth be adjudged to all of us, who walk according to that rule which the Church has handed down from the Apostles, the Apostles from Christ, Christ from God, the reasonableness of our proposition, which determines

that heretics are not to be allowed to enter upon an appeal to the Scriptures, whom we prove, without the Scriptures, to have no concern with the Scriptures, is at once made manifest."[1] *Origen*, commenting on these words of St. Matthew, "*Behold, here is Christ*," &c. says: "There will be many others too, who will be ready to say to the disciples, *out of the divine Scriptures, adding thereto their own peculiar meaning, behold, here is Christ.* . . . . But as often as they bring forward canonical Scriptures, in which every Christian agrees and believes, they seem to say: *behold, in the houses is the word of truth.* But we are not to credit them, nor to go out from the first and the ecclesiastical tradition; nor to believe otherwise than the Churches of God have by succession transmitted to us."[2] What were the sentiments of obedience and submission of St. Austin to the Church, every ecclesiastical student knows. A few words from his voluminous writings must, in such a matter, suffice. "When we read the divine books," he observes, "let us by preference select that, which, amidst the multitude of true meanings, extracted from a few words, and defended by the soundness of Catholic faith, shall seem to have been certainly his whom we read; but if this escape us, (choose) that at all events, which is not in opposition to the context of Scripture, and which harmonizes with sound faith; but if the context of the Scripture also admits not of being thoroughly handled and sifted, (select) *at least that meaning only, which sound faith prescribes.*[3] For it is one thing not to discover what the writer chiefly meant, *and another to wander from the rule of piety.*" With the authority

[1] L. de Præs. n. 37. [2] *Series Comment. in Matth.* n. 46.
[3] L. i, de Genesi ad Lit. n. 41.

of the celebrated Vincent of Lerins, I will conclude this part of my argument. In the second chapter of his "*Commonitory*," which is entitled, *Reasons for annexing the tradition of the Catholic Church to the canon of Scripture*, he says: "But perhaps here a person may ask this question; since the canon of the Scripture is perfect, and abundantly suffices for all things, what need is there for adding the authority of the Church's meaning. The reason is, because all men do not take the sacred Scripture, on account of its very profoundness, in one and the same sense; but this man interprets its language in this way, and that other in another way. So that it would appear that there might be drawn thence nearly as many opinions as there are expounders. For Novatian expounds in one way, Photinus in another, in another Sabellius, in another Donatus, in another Arius, Eunomius, Macedonius, in another Apollinaris, Priscillian, in another Jovinian, Pelagius, Celestius, in another, in fine, Nestorius. And therefore, it is very necessary, on account of the many windings of such varied error, that the line of interpretations, both of Prophets and Apostles, be directed according to the rule of the ecclesiastical and Catholic interpretation." "But perhaps someone will here ask, whether heretics make use of the testimonies of divine Scripture? Use it indeed they do, and with earnestness too. For you may see them fly over the books of Moses and of the Kingdoms, the Psalms, Apostles, Gospels, and Prophets. For whether amongst their own party or others, in private or public, in conversation or in books, at table or in the streets, they hardly ever advance anything of their own, without endeavouring to overshadow it with the words of Scripture. Read the works of Paul of Samosata,

Priscillian, Eunomius, Jovinian, and of the other pests, and (you will find an infinite collection of examples), you will find hardly a page, which is not painted and bedaubed with sentences both of the Old and New Testament. But they are to be specially avoided and dreaded, because they would hide themselves beneath the shadow of the divine law. For they are well aware that their foul savours would soon be agreeable but to few, if they were wafted forth in their natural state, and therefore they sprinkle them as it were with the perfume of God's word, that so he who would readily despise a human error, may not readily condemn the divine oracles. They therefore act like those who are preparing bitter draughts for little children; anointing the brims first with honey, that unwary youth, first tasting the sweetness, may not fear the bitterness."—(c. xxxv.) After developing his subject, and likening these texts to the sheep's covering which the wolf may assume, in order to catch and destroy its prey, he thus proceeds: "But, what says the Saviour? '*By their fruits shall ye know them.*' That is, when they shall begin, not only to bring forward these divine words, but also to expound them, not only to glory in adducing, but also in interpreting them—then that bitterness, then that sharpness, then that rage, will be perceived; then that new poison will be exhaled; then will the profane novelties be laid open; then may you first see, *the hedge broken;* then the boundaries of the fathers transferred; then the Catholic faith immolated; then the ecclesiastical dogma rent to pieces. Such were those whom the Apostle smites, in his second Epistle to the Corinthians, *for such false prophets,* he says, *are deceitful workmen, transforming themselves into the Apostles of Christ* (xi, 13).

What is '*transforming themselves into the Apostles of Christ*'? The Apostles alleged examples from the divine law; these likewise alleged them: the Apostles adduced the authorities of the Psalms; these likewise adduced them: the Apostles cited sentences of the Prophets; these also cited them. But when those things which were alleged alike, began not to be interpreted alike, then were the simple discerned from the crafty, then the sincere from the counterfeit, then the upright from the perverse, —then, in fine, the true Apostles from the false. *And no wonder*, he says, *for Satan transformeth himself into an angel of light; therefore it is no great thing, if his ministers be transformed as the ministers of justice* (xi, 14, 15). Therefore, according to the teaching of the Apostle Paul, as often as either false apostles, or false prophets, or false doctors, allege sentences from the divine law, by which, ill-interpreted, they endeavour to establish their own errors, there is no doubt but that they follow the crafty devices of their author; which he assuredly would never have invented, but that he well knew, that there is no readier way to deceive, where the fraudulency of nefarious error is covertly introduced, than to allege the authority of the divine words. But someone may say, whence is it proved that the Devil alleges examples out of the divine law? Let him read the Gospels, wherein it is written, '*then the Devil took him up*,' &c. What will he not do to poor weak men, who assailed the Lord of Majesty himself, with testimonies? *If*, says he, *thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down!* Why so? *For it is written*, quoth he, ... And if any interrogate any one of the heretics who is persuading him to these things, whence doest thou prove, whence doest thou teach that I ought

to cast aside the universal and ancient faith of the Catholic Church? at once he answers, *for it is written.* And forthwith he sets forth a thousand testimonies, a thousand examples, a thousand authorities, from the Law, from the Psalms, from the Apostles, from the Prophets, by which, interpreted in a new and evil manner, the unhappy soul may be cast headlong from the Catholic citadel, into the depths of the abyss of heresy."—(c. xxxvi, and xxxvii.) Next he refers to the boastings of heretics with regard to personal spiritual gifts, and then adds: "But someone may say, if both the Devil and his disciples, whereof some are false apostles, and false prophets, and false teachers, and all utterly heretics, do use the divine sayings, sentences, and promises, what shall Catholics, and the sons of our mother the Church, do? In what way shall they discern truth from falsehood in the holy Scriptures? They will, then, take very great care to adhere to that which, in the beginning of this Commonitory, we have said that holy and learned men had delivered to us,—*they will interpret the divine canon according to the tradition of the universal Church, and according to the rules of Catholic doctrine.* Within which Catholic and Apostolic Church, it is necessary for them to follow universality, antiquity, consent. And if at any time, *a part has rebelled against universality*, novelty has opposed antiquity, one or a few have fallen into error against the consent of all, or, at all events, of by far the greater number of Catholics, let them prefer the integrity of universality to the corruption of a part; in which same universality, let them prefer the religion of antiquity to the profaneness of novelty; and likewise, in antiquity itself, let them prefer, before the rashness of one or of a very few, first of all the general

decrees, if there be any, of an universal council; next, if such a thing be not, let them follow that which is nearest to it, that is, the statements of many and great masters agreeing together; which things, with God's help, being faithfully, soberly, carefully observed, we shall, without any great difficulty, detect all the mischievous errors of heretics as they spring up."[1] Assuredly the fathers, as all history proves, believed, because the Church taught; they interpreted the Scriptures, but where doctrinal matters were treated of, these interpretations were not primarily resultant from a careful analysis of the text. As Vincent of Lerins tells us, these interpretations were a consequence of that faith which had previously been received from the Apostolic line of teachers.

Again, it is plain that the Protestant principle renders the spread of Christianity during more than 1450 years an impossibility. According then, to this system, two things should be established; 1° It should be proveable that during that number of years, an amount of Bibles in any ways proportionate to the end to be attained, existed or could indeed have existed; and 2° That society as a body

[1] Commonit. c. xxxviii, &c. Obviously the heretics of the early ages, acted like the heretics of the present times. Scripture, Scripture, nothing but Scripture, was the cry then, as it is the cry now of all separatists from Catholicity. The wolves still wear the sheep's clothing, and the innovator hides his errors *under the shadow of the divine word.* There is nothing new in heretical action. Whoever will take up the tracts issued by heretical bodies, it matters not what they may be called, or who may be their parent, will see margin and text tricked with references to the sacred Scriptures. Indeed, the phraseology of these people is scriptural; and ever and anon, they intersperse Scripture, with ordinary narrative, in so strange a way, as to leave the hearer in wonder at the profaneness of the interpolations.

was able to read and appreciate those writings. Now not only are such propositions incapable of being proved, they are admitted on all hands to be false. Before the middle of the fifteenth century, there were indeed bibles in circulation, bibles in the original languages, and bibles too in the form of translations—but of these it might be justly asked, "*Quid sunt hæc inter tantos*"? Laborious prelates, and monks and nuns, had written out with infinite care and industry, numerous copies of the Holy Scriptures. These had worked hard and well, but the process of writing was slow, and the materials and labour were expensive. Few comparatively could engage in the task of transcription or translation, and equally few could afford to purchase works which had entailed on others years of fatigue. Hence it happened that the Bible was *comparatively* a rare work, and hence again it was seldom if ever to be seen in the hands of the poor; assuredly it was not in common use. Those who were wealthy might indeed purchase an occasional copy; and those who lived within the cloister or episcopal monastery, could borrow the sacred volume; but the bulk of the people was, and necessarily so, without the Scriptures. The Church, then as now, read, and interpreted portions of the sacred books. By teaching she made the Catholics of those days, as "wise unto salvation," as are the Catholics of the present times; but Bibles were not, could not be placed in everybody's hand; the pastors could not scatter them about "as thick as leaves in Vallombrosa," and tell the people to read and interpret for themselves. The people were essentially dependent on the Church; and the effects resultant from the modern system are such, as to make every religious mind long for the former dependence; for

thus alone can blasphemy be silenced and unity of faith restored.

A scarcity of books involves a scarcity of readers; for men will not as a body acquire with pains an art which can never render them any corresponding service. Hence it will not be rash to suppose that not one in a hundred knew how to read either the Bible or any other book. Even in these days, when millions of works of all kinds and sizes are in circulation, of many of which copies can be readily procured for the mere asking, or even something less, it is far from being true that all persons can read. It will be found indeed on examination that there are hundreds in every considerable town, and thousands in rural districts, who cannot do so, even if they chance to know the letters of the alphabet. Not one then in a hundred *could* have adopted the Protestant principle: as a form of Christianity, then, Protestantism was utterly impossible. If it was ever *possible*, it became so after the art of printing had been discovered; but not at any prior period. Protestantism then even thus viewed, cannot be identical with, or in any way a portion of primitive, early, or even mediæval Christianity. It is a religion resultant from the defection and apostacy of a King, and dependent on the human invention of the art of printing. This is its historical, and this its highest origin.

Since then, the founder of Christianity wished his religion to be published to all nations; since he attached His graces to the recognition of His creed, and uttered the most awful threat against such as did not believe; since the poor and the unlearned were as much regarded by the Saviour as the rich and the well-informed; and since again preaching, oral instruction, was fitted for the attain-

ment of the prescribed ends referred to, whilst the biblical system was an utterly inefficient system in itself, as experience has since proved, even if it had been, under circumstances, a possible system, which it assuredly was not, it follows that the Bible was not appointed by our Lord, to be the means by which Christianity was either to be begun, or spread or perpetuated.

Were it requisite, I could further show how different was the practice of primitive Christianity, from that pursued by Anglicans and Dissenters. Whilst these spread among infidels and disbelievers in their varying systems, the sacred volume, and seem in their annual reports and speeches to measure the progress of religion, by the spread of the Scriptures in translations characterized by inaccuracies resultant in some instances from an ignorance of the language of inspiration, and in others from an ignorance of modern vernacular tongues, the professors of Christianity in the early ages of the Church, guarded the divine word with the greatest care, preferring death to the delivery of the sacred volume into the hands of the infidel. "Not only was the Apostles' creed kept a secret from all but the initiated; not merely was the Lord's prayer only suffered to be communicated to the baptized; but the most watchful precaution was taken to preclude all but those already instructed, already baptized, already with their faith formed, from having the sacred books."[1] But I shall not develope this matter; for what has been said will surely have convinced every dispassionate enquirer after truth.

Hitherto our observations have mainly regarded the letter of the Scripture. Incidentally indeed, whilst stating

[1] See the eloquent letter of my Brother, *On the Index.*

what was the rule of faith admitted by the fathers, I have made a few observations regarding the interpretation of the letter; but to this point I now purpose to direct in a particular manner, the attention of the reader.

As Bishop Walton in his celebrated *Prolegomena*, c. v, § 6, well observes, "'the word of God' does not consist in mere letters, whether written or printed, but *in the true sense.*" When therefore we speak of God's word, we do not, in point of fact, speak of any particular version of the Scriptures, or even of the original *letter*, but *we mean*, if we have any meaning at all whilst speaking, *some definite statement made by the inspired writer.* In other words, we appeal *not to a sound, but to an idea; not to a mere word devoid of meaning, but to a word full of significance, a word dear and sacred, because proceeding indirectly at least from the Almighty.* Now, if this meaning be attached to the phrase 'Word of God,' if in appealing to the Scriptures we appeal to definite statements of the Almighty, it will be at once seen that the far-famed expression, 'the Bible, the Bible only,' is in the mouths of Protestants and Dissenters a sound, and nothing more. *The Scriptures do not assign their own meaning.* The words contain a meaning; more, they contain *the* meaning intended by God; further, they express this meaning: but which of all possible meanings which may be attached to any or to all of the words, of the Scriptures, *is the one meaning* of revelation, that the Scriptures never declare. The written, lithographed, or printed words stand clearly before you; though a hundred different interpretations be assigned to them, there they remain, unaltered, and unchanged; silent, notwithstanding the discrepancies and contradictions and blasphemies which may be indulged in,

in reference to their meaning. Kingdoms pass, dynasties cease, languages alter, customs change, commentary succeeds commentary, sect sect, but the Word is at the end of all these fluctuations and alterations, what it was at their commencement: *it is the same.* The text which the believer in Christ admits, is the same which the Arian read and studied, and from which he drew his anti-christian opinions. Augustin cited the Bible which was received by Pelagius; and yet whilst the former affirmed the latter denied original sin: Cyril, the zealous defender of the unity of Christ and of the θεοτόκος, did not admit a text of the Scriptures different from that which Nestorius appealed to; and if St. Cyprian endeavoured to prove from the *Vetus Itala,* the invalidity of heretical baptism, did not his successful and orthodox opponent, St. Stephen, recognise the accuracy of the texts cited by the prelate of Carthage. As Macaulay says, "All divine truth is, according to the doctrine of the Protestant churches, recorded in certain books. It is equally open to all who, in any age, can read those books; nor can all the discoveries of all the philosophers in the world add a single verse to any of those books....A Christian of the fifth century with a Bible, is neither better nor worse situated than a Christian of the nineteenth century with a Bible, candour and natural acuteness being, of course, supposed equal. It matter not at all that the compass, printing, gunpowder, steam, gas, vaccination, and a thousand other discoveries and inventions, which were unknown in the fifth century, are familiar to the nineteenth. None of these discoveries and inventions has the smallest bearing on the question; whether man is justified by faith alone, or whether the Invocation of the Saints is an orthodox

practice. It seems to us therefore that we have no security for the future, against the prevalence of any theological error[1] that ever has prevailed in time past among Christian men. We are confident that the world will never go back to the solar system of Ptolemy. . . .But when we reflect that Sir Thomas More was ready to die for the doctrine of transubstantiation, we cannot but feel some doubt whether the doctrine of transubstantiation may not triumph over all opposition. More, was a man of eminent talents. He had all the information on the subject that we have, or that, while the world lasts, any human being will have. The text, 'This is my Body,' was in his Testament as it is in ours. The absurdity (!) of this literal interpretation, was as great and as obvious in the sixteenth century, as it is now—no progress that science has made, or will make, can add to what seems to us the overwhelming force (!) of the original argument against the real presence. We are, therefore, unable to understand why what Sir Thomas More believed respecting Transubstantiation, may not be believed to the end of time by men equal in ability and honesty to Sir Thomas More."[2] These observations are very just, as far as they regard the results of bible-reading. The Bible is not progressive—and it allows itself to be turned to any unholy purpose. Even the Devil used it, as well as modern sectarians, for the attainment of his ends. He cited it as fairly, and applied as well as the generality of self-inspired interpreters do: should I be stating an untruth, and acting unfairly towards the enemies of a teaching Church, if I

[1] In fact, what is Protestantism, but a revival of dead and buried heresies?

[2] *Review of Ranke's Popes*, pp. 7, 8, 9.

even said that the demon was fairer in his references and more pointed in his applications than they are or ever have been? And need I refer to the conduct of the Jews? Did they not attempt to meet our Saviour's appeals by adducing the Scriptures? Did they not out of them urge the most horrid accusations, and by them justify their rejection of the Messias?[3]

What was done by demons, Jews, and early apostates, was imitated—the imitation was a necessary result, a consequence immediately flowing from the rejection of the Church, and the adoption of the new theory,—by Lutherans and Anglicans, and those who branched off from the Established Church. What St. Jerome says of "the garrulous old maids, and dotards, and wordy sophists,"[4] of his time, namely, that they affected to explain what they were ignorant of, and in doing so, tore the sacred words to shreds, is true of the reformers. Hardly had Luther unfurled the standard of revolt, and left the solitude of his cell to enjoy the company of Catherine Bore, than he discovered and proved too, if not to the satisfaction of others, at least to his own, that polygamy might be permitted; that man could not sin so long as he believed; and that good works rather impeded than facilitated admission into heaven. Calvin's mind was equally inventive. From the Sacred Scriptures, he derived, if his words are to be trusted, the information, that man was not possessed of free will, that God was the author

[3] See John vii, 52, and xix, 7, &c.

[4] "Hanc (Scripturarum artem) garrula anus, hanc delirus senex, hanc sophista verbosus, hanc universi præsumunt, lacerant, docent antequam discant....et ne parum hoc sit, quadam facilitate verborum, immo audaciâ, edisserunt alios quod ipsi non intelligunt." (*Epist. ad Paulinum.*)

of sin, that our reprobation or salvation depended purely on the prevision and predetermination of the Almighty, and that the last moments of our Saviour were moments of despair. Socinus was an abler man than either Luther or Calvin, and he gave indeed full play to his mind in reference to religion. He discarded at once all mysteries: his religious system rejected the Trinity, the Divinity of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, and original sin, and everything else which had been previously looked upon as truly awful, because most inexplicable. In vain did his enemies cite Scripture against him. He knew the letter as well as they did; and from this letter alone he was willing to believe that he had established his own positions, and refuted what he called the false notions of his opponents. England was less gloomy, if not less profane, in working out a new religion. Interest was consulted, as well as the Bible, and if the latter offered arguments in favour of the Establishment, the former shed light and lustre on the letter of the law. Men had itching palms; and as they beheld the gold and the silver which covered the sanctuary, and the shrines, and statues, and chalices, of enormous value; as they cast their eyes on the inventories of Monasteries, and other religious Establishments, they exclaimed—"*ad quid perditio hæc?*" and at once it was determined to ease the Church of the golden load which oppressed it, and purify the holy places from the offerings of superstition, and the idols of silver and gold which crowded them. Mistaking avarice for zeal, and sacrilege for piety, and their own imaginings for revelations, they proclaimed the use of holy symbols to be idolatrous, and the veneration of the saints and their shrines, as rank superstition. The mass was declared to

be a blasphemous fable, and the real presence was succeeded by a real absence of the body and blood of Jesus Christ. And then began the scramble for the gold and the silver, for the costly vestments and the precious stones, which had become useless, in consequence of the doctrinal changes; and poor indeed was that house, as Heylin observes, which had not become richer by the spoliation of the temple, subsequent to the alteration of religion.

But the necessary results of the system, proved sadly perplexing to the original revolters from unity. Wherever *gospel liberty* — such was the name given to the apostacy from Rome—was proclaimed, contradictory doctrines were taught, and to all appearance believed in by the people, who, willing *to avail* themselves of the better gifts —of the *charismata* recently conferred on the world— became teachers instead of scholars, and expounders in place of hearers of the written word: thus emancipating themselves from those who had first of all claimed *gospel liberty*, the right, in other words, of rejecting all authority, and of believing nobody, but *self*. Hence there soon uprose, here and elsewhere, numerous bands of self-constituted religionists, each orthodox, each supported by the written word, and each anathematizing with fiendish violence the other sects which had the boldness to dispute, or the ignorance not to appreciate the truth of the creed, which it proposed and upheld as *the* religion of the Saviour. Luther, and Calvin, and Zuingle, and Socinus; Anglicans, and Anabaptists, and Baptists, and Independents, and Unitarians, were openly opposed one to the other: mutually they denounced, they reproached, they cursed one another. In one thing each party did agree, and this agreement offered abundant evidence of the

frightful extent of the disagreement, and of the unfitness of the Scriptures to be the judge of religion,—each party agreed that it alone was orthodox, because it alone expounded aright the sacred text, and that all dissentients were grossly ignorant of holy writ. Does the Lutheran believe the real presence? See how clearly he proves it: is it not written—"this is my body"? Does the Calvinist deny it? He too will appeal to Scripture, and he will say, has not Christ said—"*I am the vine*"? and does not the Scripture add—"*Christ was the rock*"? and are not these passages clearly expository of the former words? Does the Socinian oppose the Divinity of our Lord and God Jesus Christ? He will cite in proof of his denial, the words of Christ himself—"*The Father is greater than I.*" If the Anglican admit of infant baptism, can he pretend to establish it without drawing down upon himself a storm of reproaches, and involving himself in a war of words—words derived one and all from the written record of inspiration? Will not Baptists, and Quakers, and Rationalists of numerous shades of opinion, cite text for text; and further endeavour to prove *the injustice* of even pretending to bind the child by promises which he may be hereafter unwilling to fulfil? In fine; nothing is too ridiculous for the solibiblical system; for, as history shews, all imaginable errors have been maintained by virtue of it. Not to speak of the errors of the earliest ages, which were truly gross, have not individuals in later years, appealed to the Scriptures in proof of their being, some the Saviour himself, and others the mother of the Redeemer? Is not the solifidian system to the utter disparagement of works maintained by these, and do not those laugh at sacraments and hierarchy, at mysteries, and all external rights and

observances of religion, advocating only *a religion of the Spirit*, and looking upon everything liturgical, as Jewish, and opposed to the simplicity of the Gospel? Are not sects on sects multiplying, all deflecting more and more from unity, and rending into pieces, the very fragments of religion, which were previously preserved here and elsewhere, in consequence of the assumption, that the Bible is the rule of faith? Well might Selden say—"*these two words*, SEARCH THE SCRIPTURES, *have undone the world*"; and if the English, royal heresiarch, horror struck at the mischief he himself had caused, imposed "the penalty of a month's imprisonment *toties quoties* any woman, husbandman, artificer, yeoman, servingman, apprentice or journeyman labourer, &c., should read the Scriptures to themselves or to others, privately or openly," no one, abstracting from the circumstance of the glaring inconsistency of the royal conduct, will feel surprised. His Majesty had "perceived that a great multitude of his subjects, more especially of the lower sort, had so abused the Scriptures, that they had thereby grown and encreased in divers naughty and erroneous opinions; and by occasion thereof had fallen into great divisions and dissensions among themselves."[1] What these divisions and opinions were, may be seen in Fox:[2] they are truly anti-Christian.

Is, then, the meaning of Scripture clear, or, to make the proposition somewhat more technical, is the Scripture the source of historic faith; has God given it to man in order that he may thence derive a thorough knowledge of, and a belief in, those revelations which he has been pleased to communicate? I answer fearlessly, no: and my answer

[1] Stat. 34, 35, Henrici VIII. [2] Page 1136.

is supported, 1° by all the observations previously made relative to the belief and practice of former times, as also by the obvious disunion, uncertainty, and utter want of faith, which characterize the countries, in which the solibiblical system is in vogue. 2° It is evidenced too, by all the varying and contradictory commentaries which have been published. If Christ had intended the sacred volume to be adopted as the rule of faith, assuredly he would in his wisdom and mercy, have made the instrument of faith of such a character as to be generally useful, he would have drawn it up in such a manner as to render it intelligible to the great bulk of mankind. Now, is the Scripture such an instrument; is that work intelligible to the great mass of the people; is it easily understood even by the most learned and the most pious? The answer is again plain: facts render all speculation useless. If any men were fitted, according to the Protestant notion, to understand aright the sacred text, they would be such persons as Luther and Calvin, as Socinus and Cranmer, as, in fine, the great leaders of the varying dissenting bodies who protest against the dogmatical teaching of Rome: Wesley, and Penn, and Irving, and Knox, and Carpenter, and Pye Smith, &c. Now, viewing the deductions of these men, deductions derived, so they tell us, from a careful and prayerful study of the Scriptures,—deductions drawn with a consciousness too of the awful responsibility of ascribing to the Almighty what is false, and much more, what is directly calculated to overthrow the system of his own establishing,—deductions made after a careful and critical study, not of a mere translation, but of the original text, what must we as rational beings infer? This: that the Scriptures are not easily under-

stood; further, that they are the most obscure of records, if they do contain one system of belief only, and only one code of laws in reference to faith and practice. For, what is the fact? All these commentators are opposed to one another, and so opposed as to maintain diametrically opposite systems. The real presence is maintained by Luther, and denied by Calvin; Carpenter and Socinus deny the Divinity of Jesus Christ; Penn admits no sacraments; Wesley no Episcopal hierarchy: and if Cranmer maintains Anglicanism after years of vacillation, Knox and Irving are its sworn and implacable opponents. If these men were sincere in investigating, truthful in stating their convictions, wary in drawing conclusions, and desirous of discovering the truth, and that they were all this, it would be rash for any *sectarian* to deny; then I again repeat it, the Bible is not a record easily understood; it is a document which even the learned, the good and the sincere may readily misunderstand, and which none can, *speaking independently*, so interpret, as to build on it *an article of faith.* For who will dare to say, that what so many heresiarchs have explained so differently, he understands so absolutely and positively, that his interpretation *must be right;* that all opinions different from his *must* be false; nay, more, that the very suspicion of error in reference to his interpretations, is criminal? Assuredly, no one would dare to maintain such a proposition, who was not insane: if maintained, the assertion would be looked upon, with reason, as an ebullition of unheard-of conceit and vanity, and the author of it would, instead of convincing others, either of his wisdom or inspiration, become the object of unmitigated pity or contempt. His head would be as much mistrusted as his

interpretations. Then the solibiblical system is not the rule of faith; it fixes, it determines nothing; it is at best, but a system of uncertain conjectures and uncertain critical inferences: and in such uncertainty, *faith* exists not. It reduces religion, *in point of fact*, to one single truth,—a truth, however, which is taught by nature, the belief in a God: *for in what conclusions do the solibiblists agree, beside that?* Not in the Trinity; not in the Divinity of Son and Holy Spirit; not in the governmental or sacramental systems; not in the developments of doctrine; not, in fine, in the characteristics and evidences of faith. And yet they all believe in Scripture! Put the case, that a will had been in the hands of some parties for the last three hundred years, and that notwithstanding the greatest endeavours to understand its contents, in consequence of the importance of the results which were expected to flow from its correct interpretation,—endeavours manifest in the works published on it in the form of *introductions, keys, dictionaries, expositions, paraphrases, versions, transcripts, variantia carefully marking out each alteration, however trivial and unimportant, commentaries, lectures,* as well as in the *societies* established to propagate the instrument, the *professorships* to elucidate its meaning, and the *officials* who were paid abundantly by the State to explain it week by week or oftener,—the meaning of *that will* should after the long period of three hundred years, be as little agreed upon, as men are agreed upon the meaning of the Bible, what conclusion would be universally adopted? This, without doubt: that that will was difficult to be understood; that it was a hopeless thing to expect to understand it, unless some heavenly witness bore evidence to its meaning,—*εἰ μὴ θεὸς ὑφηγοῖτο*, as Plato observed in

reference to the necessity of the advent of a God to remove the ignorance of his times;[1] that it was a palpable absurdity in the midst of the disputes of the wisest, and the differences of the best, to assert that anybody and everybody, every dotard, and every sophist, and babbling woman, could easily interpret it, and interpret it so confidently, as to *stake both body and soul on its interpretation.* Such would be the observation of men, in relation to a will strenuously contested; why is their language different in reference to the Scriptures, when the *hypothesis* referred to in regard of a will, is *a fact* in regard of the Scriptures. To this fact I confidently appeal: it is the fullest reply to the texts to which some men and women foolishly appeal. The scholar's answer to the sophist's argument against motion, was the most conclusive possible—*he moved.* So here, the best answer to those who maintain *in words* that the Bible is the rule of faith, and a rule fitted for all persons, is to point *to facts* as plain as the world itself. These will *show* that it is *not* the rule of faith: that it is neither an easy, nor a possible means to lead mankind to unity of religion; that it is in point of fact *the principle of disunion and division, and irreconcileable differences;* that to this, demon and infidel, rationalist and Protestant appeal alike, and with equal success.

To talk of the Bible being an easily understood book, is to prove oneself grossly ignorant of the Scriptures. For 1° As our illustrious Cardinal[2] has recently observed, "what meaning will the ordinary (or indeed talented) reader

[1] Plato *in Epinomide;* as also see his second *Alcibiades.*

[2] The Bible in Maynooth, p. 13.

draw from the poetry of the Prophets; from the woes of Isaias against the Moabites, Ethiopians, Babylonians, and Syrians; from the obscure parabolic visions of Ezechiel; from the locusts of Joel, the unclean marriages of Osee, the murmurings of Jonas, the dark adumbrations of Habaccuc. And the Psalms, and Job, and Ecclesiastes, so deep, so obscure, so full of danger to a single false step in misapplication, who can conceive what nonsense, or even blasphemy, an untutored mind may elaborate from them, reading them, and certainly not understanding them, with the proud assurance, that he is just as privileged as the most learned doctor, to comprehend, and to explain, and to apply whatever they contain? And last of all, take the "Canticle of Canticles." What delicacy of mind and feeling, what a knowledge of the existence and principles of a mystical application, what a power of abstracting from apparent sensuality of thought and phrase, and dwelling only on its chastest antagonism—love divine—does not this most mysterious, most perplexing, most bewildering gift of divine inspiration demand, for its profitable, or even its safe perusal? We hesitate not to repeat, that merely as a book to be understood, the Bible presents more difficulties, independent of phraseology or style, than any other work." These words are little more in fact, than an echo of those used by the Venerable Fenelon, in his letter to the Bishop of Arras, *on Bible reading*, and by Dr. Balguy: "Open your Bibles," says the latter, "take the first page that occurs in either Testament, and tell me, without disguise, is there nothing in it too hard for your understanding? If you find all before you clear and easy, you may thank God for giving you a privilege which he has denied to so many thousands of sincere

believers." And the poet of English prose writers, Jeremy Taylor, has used equally emphatic language, in his work on the *Liberty of Prophesying:* "Since there are so many copies (of Scripture) with infinite variations of reading; since a various interpunction, a parenthesis, a letter, an accent, may much alter the sense; since some places have divers literal senses, may have spiritual, mystical, and allegorical meanings; since there are so many tropes, metonymies, ironies, hyperboles, proprieties and improprieties of language, whose understanding depends upon such circumstances that it is almost impossible to know the proper interpretation..... since there are some mysteries which, at the best advantage of expression, are not easy to be apprehended, and whose explication, by reason of our imperfection, must needs be dark and sometimes unintelligible; and lastly, since these ordinary means of expounding Scripture, as searching the originals, conference of places, parity of reason, analogy of faith, are all dubious, uncertain, and very fallible, he that is the wisest, and by consequence the likeliest to expound truest, in all probability of reason will be very far from confidence, because every one of these, and many more, are like so many degrees of improbability and uncertainty, all depressing our certainty of finding out truth in such mysteries and amidst so many difficulties."[1] Locke, too, in his preface to St. Paul's Epistles, honestly declares that he neither understood the doctrinal nor the discursive parts of those Epistles. He could fathom the depths of the "human understanding," but the Scriptures were

[1] *Liberty of Prophesying, sect.* 4. See too on this head the Honble. Mr. Boyle's observations on the nature of St. Paul's Epistles, in his *Style of Scripture.*

admittedly beyond his intellectual grasp. And yet we are gravely told that the Scriptures are easy, and that every blockhead is to read and interpret them; and further, we are condemned to be branded as profane, and treated as enemies of the light, for maintaining, with Balguy, and Taylor, and Locke, that the Scriptures are not only difficult, but absolutely useless for the attainment of the end to which Protestantism applies them.

2° To the biblical student it is well known, that the Scriptures abound in tropes, figures, and modes of expression once perhaps familiar to those to whom they were addressed, and among whom they were written, but now strange to us at all times, and frequently unintelligible.

3° They abound in allusions now forgotten, in historical facts to which we have no other references, and in chronologies and genealogies which we cannot clear up by means of such history as has been handed down to our days.

4° Inverted and partial statements; transitions too which necessarily obscure the end and object of the writer; epitomes too short to render the record clear; statements which appear contradictory, and which thousands have endeavoured to conciliate ineffectually; prophecies of uncertain fulfilment, whether time, or place, or person be considered; and mysteries of unfathomable depth occur in nearly every book of the sacred text, and prove the difficulty of interpreting Holy Writ. The wonder then is not, that the eunuch exclaimed, "How can I (understand the Scriptures), if no one show me?",[1] or that our blessed Redeemer explained and interpreted the written word, that his Apostles *might understand*,[2] or again, that St.

[1] Acts viii, 31. [2] Luke xxiv, 45.

Peter stated, in reference to the writings which had just appeared of St. Paul, that there were some things in them which could be with difficulty understood;[3] but here is matter for amazement, that any persons should be so rash, as to assert that the Scriptures are easy, that every person may interpret them, and that Christ has acted so foolishly, as to make his Church dependent on such interpretation! Look at the promises made by the Solibiblists, and compare them with facts;

Quid dignum tanto feret hic promissor hiatu?

What have they done? Have they agreed upon the meaning of the text? Have they succeeded in establishing unity of faith, by their principle? Have they given one proof—but one—to the world, that unity of faith is increasing, and that there is a chance of a common belief through the *common* blessing of the circulation of the Holy Volume? Let Lutherans and Calvinists, Socinians and Anglicans, Baptists and Independents, Presbyterians and Methodists, answer. This answer will be a singular instance of what the poet calls—*symphonia discors!*

Indeed, Protestants, thoughtful, intelligent, studious Protestants, themselves repudiate the tenet of Anglicanism—the proposition so confidently uttered in the pulpit and on the platform—"that the Bible, and the Bible only, is the rule of faith." The great Hooker, in his *Ecclesiastical Polity*, says, "The Scripture could not teach us the things of God; unless we did *credit men, who have taught us that the words of Scripture did signify those things.*"[4] And Lord Bolingbroke is equally explicit: "Writers of

[3] 2 Epist. iii, 16. [4] Hooker, l. c. p. 116.

the Roman religion have attempted to show, that the text of Holy Writ is on many accounts, insufficient to be the sole criterion of orthodoxy. *I apprehend, too, that they have shown it.* Sure I am, that experience, from the first promulgation of Christianity to this hour, shows abundantly, with how much ease and success, the most opposite, the most extravagant, nay, the most impious opinions and the most contradictory faiths, may be founded on the same text, and plausibly defended by the same authority."[1] Still later, the Protestant principle has, to my mind, been wholly abandoned, as utterly untenable, by an able and thoughtful writer in the *British Critic*, whose ideas I will lay before the reader, omitting, however, such portions of his observations as are not absolutely required for the elucidation of his meaning. "'*That the Bible, and the Bible only, is the religion of the Protestant,*' is a saying undoubtedly true, *when taken in its proper sense.* But we fear that, in these days, it is passed from mouth to mouth, with but little consideration of the import which it bore in the mind of its first utterer, and with as yet little sympathy in his theological views. We have, indeed, more especially of late, been much dissatisfied with the indiscriminate manner in which so pregnant a proposition has been bandied about, and been not seldom astonished, if not disgusted, at the careless unexploring confidence with which men have put forward a saying, which bears on its very front, to enquiring eyes at least, the marks of deep and difficult theological debate. . . . . As it is commonly understood, we believe, by the noisy and loquacious debaters of this day, it means that the Christian needs study no other ecclesiastical authors, than such as

[1] Fifth letter on the Use and Study of History.

are contained in the sacred canon, and even the study thus limited, is, in the case of almost all those persons, still farther confined to the English version, and English commentaries. No wonder that so many should think themselves qualified expounders of what seems in such easy reach, and almost to come to every man's door. . . . . Every one who reads it (the New Testament) with that accurate and yet comprehensive view which it demands from a scholar and divine, must observe in it *germs*, as it were, *not expanded into full meaning*, allusions incidentally made, which, as soon as he steps beyond the limits of the volume, he finds put forth in the early fathers into visible blossoms and fulness. Such, for instance, is the case of the institution of the Lord's Day, and of the establishment of Episcopal government, of which, observing the elements in the New Testament, and finding the maturity in the early fathers, we can no more doubt of their apostolical authority, than as if they had been explicitely laid down and commanded in the New Testament, as the institution of the Sabbath and the appointment of the Aaronic Priesthood are enjoined in the Old. . . . .

"Perhaps we shall be now asked, in what sense we ourselves understand the much bruited apophthegm, 'the Bible, and the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants.' We will give it as briefly as we can, and it is this, that since the volume of the New Testament is of such a nature externally as we have just described, and from its internal nature (consisting as it does of independent treatises, though all bearing to the same end) in very many places alludes rather than expresses, hints circumstances rather than relates them, takes for granted rather than enjoins, on this account, the person who would examine for him-

self the foundations of his Church, or who may distrust its institutions, or be pressed with doctrines strange to his communion, yet pretending to Apostolic antiquity, who may be asked on what principle he acknowledges the canon of Scripture itself, to such a person we say, *the Bible, and the Bible only, is not sufficient to establish his religion.* He must proceed beyond the volume into the immediately succeeding series of uncanonical writers, before he can meet with all the satisfaction which he requires; at the same time he must previously have well studied that volume, must have diligently imbibed its spirit, marked well the nature and relative position of the passages, by which he is referred to succeeding writers. Thus he will enter upon the field of tradition, informed with a knowledge to distinguish the wheat from the chaff, what is of Christ, and what is not of Christ; what immediately runs into union with the pure gold of Scripture, and what is averse to it. Thus is the Bible only the religion of Protestants: but it is the Bible as read by the founders of Protestantism, the Bible as read by the builders and worthies of our excellent Church, by Cranmer, by Parker, by Jewel, by Hooker, by Bull, by Taylor, by Barrow....."[1] These writers felt as others had previously, that it was monstrous to maintain the popular cry and popular notion regarding the Bible. The popular notion then, turns out to be absolutely false. It is not the Bible *alone*, but the Bible with the primitive fathers of Christianity, and with the primitive fathers of Anglicanism. Ignatius, and Clement, and Polycarp, must help Cranmer, and Bull, and Jewel, and such like worthies, to develope the germ, and elucidate the obscure. But is the

[1] *British Critic*, vol. x, pp. 256-8, 1831.

mass of society benefited by this observation? is it drawn nearer to the truth in consequence of it? No. For 1° Is *this* principle Scriptural, that the fathers must be *read*, and that Cranmer and his are fair tests and criterions of orthodoxy? 2° Is it a principle which is admitted generally; is it a principle which can be honored with the name of Catholic, because universally applicable? Assuredly not: the world at large cannot read either Ignatius' or Polycarp's opinions, or the opinions of Cranmer, and Jewel, and Bull. They have not their works; and, if they had them, they would not be better able to understand their doctrinal systems, than the system of faith which may be contained in the pages of the New Testament: and what is more, all separatists from Anglicanism will laugh at the idea of pinning their faith to the phylacteries of such changelings as Cranmer and Jewel. They will ask, why appeal to man, instead of God; why go to the fallible, for the exposition of the infallible; why cry out the Bible, and the Bible only, and eventually declare that it is Polycarp, in fact, and Cranmer, who are to rule and regulate the faith of Christendom. Was not Knox as able as Jewel, and Wesley as inspired as Parker, and Penn as disinterested in adopting biblical conclusions and upraising his system, as that Cranmer who retracted and retracted, married and divorced, burnt some for believing the real presence, and others for disbelieving it? And if so, why explain the Gospels according to Cranmer rather than according to Penn, and prefer Jewel to the rude Scottish zealot, Knox? 3° Is it a principle which is consistent? Did not Anglicanism begin in the rejection of all testimony? Did it not everywhere proclaim that the world could err, and had actually be-

come apostate? Did it not state that the Bible was man's guide, to the exclusion of popes, prelates, and ministers of religion, all of whom it was stated, were liable to error and deceit? How then can authority be consistently appealed to? How can those, who have been taught to believe in the doctrine of a fallible Church, be expected, after the establishment of Anglicanism, to trust in a handful of men, such as Cranmer, and Jewel, and Parker? 4° Even if the writers named were consentient, this would not be any argument in proof of their doctrines being divine: for thousands on thousands of authors of acknowledged merit, equally eminent as biblists and as scholars, adopt and defend conclusions widely different. But are they consentient? Do they all uphold the same doctrines? Are they even always self-consistent? They are not, as every scholar knows. Cranmer is opposed to Cranmer,[1] and Jewel's greatest enemy, is John Jewel, whilom Bishop of Salisbury. *Reading* is not the means of arriving at faith: it is not by means of a book, that we are to believe: "*Faith cometh through hearing, and hearing through the word of God.*" The task of wading through the fathers, and adopting right conclusions, is impossible to mankind at large. Men must be taught, and taught authoritatively. Such a system of teaching may convey to us the meaning of the sacred Scriptures and of the fathers, and guard us against mistakes and errors, affecting the deposit of doctrine and morality which Christ committed to the safe keeping of his spouse, the Church; a less authoritative and divine teacher will not suffice.

In fact, as far as I can gather from the writings of this

[1] On this matter see an able work entitled, "Tract XC Considered," p. 16.

century, even Protestants more than doubt of the truth of their principle, as applied to all mankind. They see the inconsistency of maintaining that the Bible is easily understood, when after all their researches they are forced to allow that it is replete with difficulties—difficulties which affect nothing less than the very foundation of all Christianity. They blush in the *face of facts,* to proclaim it, the source of union; and if all those conclusions are deserving of attention, which are said to be advocated by the letter of the Scripture, there is indeed cause enough for shame. They see the folly of saying that every one who chooses to interpret, and assume the character of expounder of the written word, is as deserving of credit, and as entitled by God to decide on the dogmatical and moral code contained in the Bible, as the ministers of religion themselves,—as the whole Church, even taken conjunctively. Hence, they would have some kind of subordination; they would limit the extent of this principle; they would empower only a portion of the community to explain the sacred records for themselves, whilst the remainder should be compelled to listen to and acquiesce in the explanations offered them of the meaning of holy writ. In a word, by some persons at least, faithful expounders are required; and to such, the Bible is not the only rule of faith. And in point of fact, did not Anglicanism stultify itself, as De Maistre has well observed, and expose the hollowness of the cry—"*liberty of conscience,*" by the publication of articles, and homilies, and prayer-books, which were to be received as certain, and conformable to holy writ. The Dissenters, as a body, have not been thus inconsistent; and owing to their stricter adherence to principle, they, as well as

Catholics, have been enabled to aim many a deadly blow at Protestantism.[1]

But the Protestant limitation just adduced will not suffice. *The principle is universal;* and these would-be teachers, have no right to lord it over the consciences and understandings even of the lowest and the meanest, by altering that principle. On *its universal truth*, was constructed Protestantism: deny its universal applicability, and Protestantism is even thus proved to be a delusion and a deceit. The texts cited in favour of the principle *against Catholics*, as also *the grounds* of that principle, namely, that man is fallible, and God's word only, infallible, all evince the same thing: namely, that the Bible was originally held up as the sole authority through which faith was attainable.

And indeed, pitiful would be the position of the poor, and of the illiterate, if, after having abandoned the authority of priests, bishops, popes, councils, fathers, and the whole of Christendom,—these were directly opposed and set at nought at the Reformation, on the plea, that the whole world might err and actually had erred,—they were to be obliged to attach their belief to the teaching of one or more individuals, whose authority was admitted to be fallible, who claimed no connexion with any unerring line of prelacy, and whose mission *thus* to preach, and thus to dogmatize, had no evidences. The explana-

[1] See in evidence of this, the famous Unitarian works of *Acton* and *Carpenter;* as also the more recent works of the Hallite, *Beverley*. Gandolfy's congratulatory letter to Dr. Marsh of Peterborough is very able too. In vain did the bishop endeavour to escape from the consequences of his own declaration, that the Prayer-book ought to be circulated with the Bible.

tions even of a Mant, and a Clarke, and a Whitby, are but *their* interpretations; perhaps capricious and fanciful expositions, which others, equally learned, utterly and entirely repudiate. Taught by such men, or an inferior order of men, how can the illiterate have faith? They may have faith in Mant, in Clarke, in Whitby, but have they, and is this a consequence, faith in the positive revelation of God? It should always be remembered, that the interpretations of these men, are ignored by the bulk of mankind, are admitted by none save a few of their own party, who only look upon them, at the best, as probable inferences, and *fallible* deductions. And are such authorities to be the grounds of faith? No: *restriction of interpretation is only tolerable, under a system of infallibility.*[2]

Whoever will call to mind, the workings of this principle, and further remember that instead of one creed, there are in England at least two hundred organized religions, the members of which hardly ever believe alike; that in Germany, as Starke, in his *entretiens*, and Muller,

[2] In opposition to these advocates for a *modified* license of expounding the Scripture, I would wish to draw the attention of the reader to the opinions of some distinguished Protestant writers. "The Protestant Church," says Bishop Watson, "permits *every individual* '*et sentire quæ velit, et quæ sentiat, loqui.*'" "The principle of the Reformation," says Bishop Warburton, "was not so much the right of separation from the errors of a corrupt Church, as that Christian liberty which gives *every man* a right to worship God according to his conscience." Bishop Hurd observes, "Our incomparable Chillingworth, and some others established, for ever, the old principle, that the Bible and that only, interpreted by our best reason, is the religion of Protestants." "The Protestant acknowledges no universal head, nor deems the Church itself, acting even by its legitimate rulers, to be either gifted with infallibility, or vested with such authority as may annul *the right of its individual members to appeal to the Scripture itself.*"—Van Mildert, *Bampton Lectures.*

notice, there is scarcely one doctrine of Christianity which is not systematically denied by the Lutherans, whilst in Switzerland, the Calvinists blush to mention the doctrine of original sin, and endeavour to rid themselves of everything allied to the miraculous or the mysterious, and that in all these countries, both the clergy and laity advocate these contradictory and antichristian systems, on the warrantee, and by virtue of, holy writ, will wonder how it comes to pass, that such a principle can possibly be maintained, as a principle of unity, and of belief. I am not arguing from the accidental abuses of the system; I am appealing to natural results; results which coexist with the system, and are identified with it; results which are inseparable from it, so long as each person is to be his own teacher, his own expounder, his own guide in the study, not merely of biblical hermeneutics, but of bible faith, and bible faith only.

As long as men are unequal in society, unequal in leisure, in talents, in research, unequal in the appliances and means of study, and society cannot exist without these and other differences; so long must there be, as we have already shewn from the admitted nature of the sacred writings, the widest differences of interpretations, and the most contradictory inferences.[1] This was even seen by Voltaire. "If (he says) there was not an authority to fix and determine the sense of the Bible, and the dogmas of religion, the consequence would then be, that there would be as many sects, as there are individuals who read

[1] Even Tillotson says—"We are not infallibly certain, that any book of Scripture is so ancient as it pretends to be; or that it was written by the persons whose name it bears; *nor that this is the sense of such and such passages in it. All this may possibly be otherwise.*"

the Bible."[2] Admit once the rule of Protestantism, and it is impossible to say what will be the inferences which the mind of man may draw from the Scriptures. What appears true to-day, may to-morrow be adjudged false. As knowledge comes, changes may result; and he who began the year with fancying that he could prove from Scripture, the mystery of the Trinity, and the Divinity of Christ, the heavenly origin of the hierarchy, and of the Sacraments, may end it in rejecting each and all of these former articles of his ideal Church. This has been observed upon not only by the French Encyclopædists, in their analysis and careful examination of the distinctive rule of Protestantism, but also by Protestants themselves. "The greatest benefit derived to religion by the efforts of the reformers, (says Nightingale,) is that doctrine, which they so often disallowed to others, but which they found so convenient to themselves, of acknowledging the unrestrained right of *private judgment in matters of faith.* And there is little risk in asserting that, whoever proposes any contrary terms or articles of union, as necessary to be admitted, violates one of the leading and fundamental principles of the Protestant Reformation. But this would lead to downright Socinianism, as the Catholics charge upon us. May be so. The charge is not without foundation, notwithstanding what some excellent Protestants have written on the subject. This dreadful consequence may follow. It is a lamentable case. But there is no way to prevent it, while you allow the principle. You may issue your orders of synods, convocations, conferences, and acts of uniformity;—you may enlarge or curtail the thirty-nine Articles;—you

[2] Essai sur l'histoire.

may even pronounce the sentence of God's wrath and damnation against heretics and schismatics: so long as you admit that groundwork of the reformation—*the right of private judgment*—though you spend your strength in fulminations and your skill in devising new terms of salvation, you will only be laughed at by the discerning Christian, as inconsistent and intolerant." The believer in *the Trinity* has no right, as a Protestant, to condemn the Antitrinitarian, nor has the adorer of Christ, in this system, *a right* to speak against him who is a sincere Arian or Socinian; because these have *as much right* to read and interpret as the professors of rival creeds. The disbeliever in Mysteries, has, on biblical grounds, as much reason to upbraid protestantism and dissent, as Dissenters and Protestants can have to reproach him. Faith, emanating from such a source, is an uncertain thing: it is a Proteus—a creature of fables and fancies: it is not the revelation of the Almighty, fixed, determined, unalterable, eternal. He who possesses real faith, knows that this latter kind of belief alone, is Christian. *Protestantism* then *is not Christian:* its first notion is destructive of Christianity. See the creeds it upholds, and the religions it has established; and its antagonism to revelation will be seen and readily admitted by the sincere.

Though Protestantism has no right to appeal to the Scriptures, as we have shown, and as others who wrote against heresies in general have demonstrated seventeen hundred years ago, in opposition to that *authority* whence alone the knowledge of the letter of the Scriptures has been derived: though again this appeal can have no weight as an argument for those very reasons which we have stated at considerable length, still since it may be

useful to see on what passages of holy writ Protestants rely, whilst maintaining that the Bible alone as interpreted by each individual is the rule of faith *for the Christian*, I will bring before the reader the leading texts which to some at least seem to bear out their case.

The most remarkable passage which is ever brought forward is the 39th verse of the fifth chapter of St. John's Gospel: "Search the Scriptures, for you think in them to have everlasting life; and the same are they, that give testimony of me." 1° I have already observed on these words; and the reader will not fail to remember the argument of Bishop Jebbe in favor of the reading, "You do search the Scriptures." Thus interpreted, or rather thus translated, a fact is simply stated, not a *command;* and the command alone can bear out even in appearance the Protestant theory. But 2°, to what do the words refer? to the means of arriving at the knowledge of the particular truths of Christianity? No: to the means of discovering *Christ;* to the knowledge of his being the Messias promised by the prophets. To what Scriptures again do they refer? To the Scriptures of the new Law, which contain documents relating to and written by Christians, or to the Scriptures of the old Law, which contain the precepts and doctrines enunciated for the benefit of the Jew? They allude only to the latter; for, when Christ spoke, not a letter of the new Law had been penned, nor was a letter of it penned for years and years afterwards. Since Christianity was a new Law, since it contained revelations unknown to the Jews, and positive ordinances dependent solely on the will and beneficence of Christ, obviously it would be folly to appeal to the Old Testament in proof of the specific doctrines and

ordinances of the new system. 3° Were not men bound *to hear and obey Christ,* when Christ was known? Would fallible men in the presence of this admitted infallible Messias be allowed to search and judge for themselves? Was it not the bounden duty of men to hear and believe what Christ said, whatever might be their private comment on either his words or deeds? Obviously so: and even Protestants allow that if there were now an infallible teacher enunciating the meaning of the sacred oracles, or the revelation in general of Jesus Christ, every one would be bound to obey him. Hence, Apostles believed, not because they had read, but because they had heard; not because they understood in this or that manner the Sacred Scriptures, but because the God of the Scriptures had himself taught them, and proved his word to be divine, by evidencing his divinity: "*Master, to whom shall we go? thou hast the words of eternal life.*"

The text is clearly then beside the question—it does not even remotely regard the point at issue. At the most, it can only be referred to the oracles testificatory of our Lord's character, and not to the way in which one who believes in Christ, who is already a Christian, is to learn the truths of Christianity. It regards, in a word, the unbeliever, not the believer. But the Protestant wants to know what course the BELIEVER is to pursue—what rule he is to follow WHO ADMITS CHRIST to be the very truth. Already we have answered the question; we have shown that our Lord *taught,* and bade others *teach,* all that he had *said*; and furthermore he invested these teachers with his own authority.

To render still clearer the nullity of such a reference, I will now draw the reader's attention to the dissimilarity

existing between *the Jew* and the *believer in Christ.* 1° The Jew was already possessed of a divine system of religion, one of the principal articles of which was a belief in a future Messias. 2° He received from his Church the Sacred Scriptures, and on its authority held them to be divine. 3° All or most of the sacrifices, at which he assisted, had a reference to the coming and sufferings of the Redeemer, and he was informed which were the prophecies to be fulfilled by the Messias. Now, on the other hand, the Protestant, who takes the bible to guide him to faith, is supposed 1° to have no Church, no belief; 2° he has no authority for the sacred records, inasmuch as he rejects all authority if he is a consistent Protestant, as we have already proved: he has no assurance of the inspiration, genuineness, canonicity, or incorruption of the Scriptures, independent of the Catholic Church, which adduces as powerful proofs in favour of its perpetuity, inerrancy, and authority to teach, as it offers in favour of the divinity of the sacred writings. 3° The Protestant has no guide *to* or *in* the Sacred Scriptures; he has no prophets assigning certain passages as the divine expression of this or that tenet. He is himself the Prophet to the Bible, self-constituted and self-deceived. Those to whom Christ *spoke* are supposed by many writers to have been the Doctors of the Sanhedrim, who were styled the pillars of instruction, and noted for their skill in the Scriptures;[1] but be this as it may, our Lord's hearers were referred by him to well-known and well-proved documents—to documents legitimately explained—to documents of which the teacher and establisher of Christianity said at last that they bore evidence of him: whereas Protestantism directs not priests

[1] See on this head, Elsley's Annotations, vol. iii, p. 53.

and ministers only, but the whole of mankind, to expound the Scriptures, and interpret them, without the aid of any infallible authority; asserting *a doctrine,* and saying that that is in the Scriptures. If a doctrine *be already known,* known by virtue of a heavenly statement, then there is no danger *to him who believes that doctrine,* in searching for the written evidence.[1] Thus to the Catholic *who believes before he reads,* the Scriptures offer fresh and fresh evidences, and the more *he searches,* the greater appears to be the number of references and allusions in the sacred writings to his doctrines. But the question with the Protestant is about the doctrine. He does not believe at all before, he only believes in consequence of, reading. He has no polar star, as it were, to guide him in his course. His course depends upon his lesser or greater ignorance or knowledge, boldness or timidity. The differ-

[1] Tertullian's observations on this head are very apt and illustrative. "For us there is no need," he says, "of curiosity after Christ Jesus, nor of enquiry after the Gospel. When we do believe, we do not desire to believe anything besides. For this we believe from the first, that there is nothing which we ought to believe besides. I come, therefore, to that point which even ours adduce for *entering on,* and which heretics urge for introducing curious enquiry. It is written, they say, '*Seek and ye shall find.*' Let us remember on what occasion the Lord uttered this saying. In the very first beginning, I imagine, of his teaching, when it was doubted by all men whether he was the Christ, and when as yet not even Peter had pronounced him the Son of God, and John had ceased to be certain about him. With reason, therefore, was it then said '*Seek and ye shall find,*' at a time when he was yet to be sought, who was not yet acknowledged. And this as regards the Jews: for to them pertains the whole language of this reproach, as having wherein they might seek Christ. '*They have,*' he says, '*Moses and Elias, the law and the prophets which preach Christ;*' agreeably to which also, in another place, he says openly: '*Search the Scriptures in which ye hope for salvation, for they speak of me.*'"—*De Præscrip.* c. viii.

ence, then, between the position of the Jew and the Christian is most marked; and this difference will show the folly of referring to John v, 39. Whatever Christ might be in himself, he was nothing to others, till he was known. Now, how does our divine Saviour act, in order to prove his real character, in the discourse of which the words cited form but a small portion. First, he tells the Jews, that *John* had borne witness to Him, "Ye sent unto John, and he bore witness unto the truth:" and he appeals to his own *miracles* as affording still more conclusive evidence:—"But I have greater witness than that of John: for the works which the Father hath given me to finish, the same works that I do, bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me." Afterwards he appeals to a third witness, *the testimony of his Father:* "And the Father himself," he says, "who hath sent me, hath borne witness of me;" and lastly he observes: "*Ye search the Scriptures,* for in them ye think ye have eternal life; *and they are they which testify of me; and ye will not come to me, that ye might have life.*"[2] Thus it appears, that Christ is condemning the Jews for their obduracy. Though John, and miracles and the Eternal Father and the Scriptures, all proclaimed the same one truth, that Christ was the Messias, still the Jews remained obdurate. Evidences enough were given, and yet all were rejected. Any one was sufficient. Sufficient was the testimony of John; sufficient was the testification of the Father; sufficient were the miracles which Christ had wrought; but *all collectively* were disregarded and despised. Hence this followed: if the Jews were incredulous, if they refused to hear the Messias, the fault was their own—not God's. This was

[2] John v, 33, 36, 37, 39.

the conclusion which Christ drew, and not this other: the Bible is the only rule of faith. With as much reason might *John*, or the word which came from heaven, or miracles be declared to be the only *rule of faith*, as the Scriptures which Christ named.

Christ acted, in a word, precisely in the same manner as the Christian does, when about to establish the Divinity of Christianity. He adduced the motives of credibility, before he demanded submission to his teachings. So the Christian who wishes to prove to Jew or Gentile the divinity of his system, proves it by extrinsic motives to be divine. Until this is done, Christianity is extrinsically of no authority to the Infidel. But, if this Christianity be proved, then belief in its dogmas is a duty. What does this Christianity teach, is the next obvious query; as the query after, not before, the evidences had been given in proof of Christ's divinity would be, what has Christ taught, and from what source am I to derive full information, relative to the distinctive dogmas and regulations of the Christian dispensation?

At all events, the result of the Jewish appeal to Scripture will not appear very satisfactory to the Protestant:—it ended in disbelief, and in the rejection of Jesus Christ. "*There is one that accuseth you, Moses, in whom ye trust. For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me: for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words.*"[1] The Jews did not reject Moses' writings, neither did they disbelieve the letter of the law, still they are said not to have believed. Why? Because they turned the text from its obvious meaning, and substituted their interpretations for the Word of God.

[1] St. John v, 45, 47.

This is precisely what the separatists from Rome do. The written word bears testimony to the inerrancy, infallibility, and perpetuity of the Church; it teaches that the Church of the living God is not an insular Church, the Church of one kingdom, a Church established by an Act of Parliament, but the Church of all nations, and an establishment founded by the Most High; it teaches the doctrines of the Holy Eucharist, of the remission of sins through the ministers of religion, of the efficacy of the Holy Unction in the hour of sickness, and of the intercessorship of those who stand before the throne of God; it maintains the usefulness of praying for the dead, the necessity and merit of works; in fine, it proves that the Christian is to have for ever an altar and a sacrifice—a sacrifice pure and holy, offered up according to the rite of Melchisedech. But what the better are those who read these texts if they continue ignorant of the doctrines of Jesus Christ? None. They stand accused by Jesus, and the Apostles, and the inspired writers in general. They neither believe the sacred *writings*, nor do they credit the divine *words* of Christ. In the midst of light they are in darkness, and though possessed of the letter of the law, they are without the spirit which gives meaning, and force, and understanding. The letter kills; it is like the lifeless body, a principle to some, of corruption and of pestilence: it is the odour of death unto death.

Similarly inapplicable will appear on examination a second text often appealed to with confidence by Protestants; namely, the 11th verse of the *xvii c. of the Acts of the Apostles*. It is related in the chapter referred to, 1° that St. Paul when at Thessalonica entered the Synagogue of the Jews, where for three Sabbath days he

reasoned with them out of the Scriptures relative to the fulfilment of the prophecies regarding the Messias, in the person of Jesus Christ. 2° The result of this was, that whilst some believed, others disbelieved, and by these a sedition was raised against the heavenly-commissioned disputant. 3° The Brethren, in consequence, "sent away Paul and Silas by night into Berea, who coming thither went into the Synagogue of the Jews." 4° Of these Bereans, this testimony is given, and the testimony is the matter of the Protestant objection which we are about to investigate. "These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures daily whether those things were so. Therefore, many of them believed. Also, the honourable women who were Greeks, and of men not a few." The answer is clear to this ideal difficulty. 1° The persons addressed were not Christians but Jews; who had to learn that the Messias had come. 2° Out of the documents which they knew to be divine, the Jews were *taught* by St. Paul, and infallibly, the truth. 3° They heard his word; they examined his arguments, and the result was conviction. But when *convinced*, what was the rule of Christianity? Can any one doubt after what we have said? Then the Apostolic word was to be heard and believed: the chooser then became a heretic; and the teacher of a doctrine opposed to that of Paul, even had he been an angel, would have been subjected to the Pauline anathema. As I have before observed, it is one thing to examine the Scriptures for the motives of credibility leading to Christianity, and another thing to examine them as the only rule of faith after a person is a believer in Christianity in general. Again, it

is very different to examine them, when expounded and positively referred to by one of the ministerial line appointed to develope the truths of religion, and to examine them, ignorant of doctrine and without an infallible exponent. It is, in fine, very different for the Christian minister to argue with the Jew on his own grounds, in order to convict him of his errors against Christ, and to maintain that the knowledge of the doctrines of Christianity rests on that principle which may have effectually disproved Judaism. To the present hour, the Catholic minister acts towards the Jew, precisely as St. Paul did. He points to the prophecies which the Jews admit, and shows how in Christ all have been fulfilled: he furthermore, like the Redeemer, appeals to the fact of miracles admitted even by Josephus, and to those other evidences with which the readers of works on revelation and Christianity are already familiar. But would Jew or Gentile thence infer that such evidences were the rule of each specific doctrine of the Christian faith; that the Christian had no authoritative teachers of his doctrines and practices. No: and this is evident in the conduct of the learned and pious Jews and Gentiles who have been aggregated to the fold of Catholicity, in all ages, not excluding the present.[1] St. Paul, in a word, attached a specific meaning to the Scriptures; those who corresponded with his teaching and believed, became Christians, and those who did not, remained unbelievers. So now, the Church gives her divine evidence as to the nature and meaning of the sacred word: those who believe become members of the Church, whilst the disbelievers remain to their own ruin, out of the

[1] The reader who has followed the history of conversions, will be familiar with the names of Drach, Ratisbon, and others.

fold. Will the Protestant justify those who rejected Christ's word or St. Paul's on account of their own interpretations, interpretations opposed to that which had been divinely given? If not, why in the name of common sense and religion appeal to the conduct either of the priests, or of the scribes, or of the Bereans? In the observations made years ago by Dr. Bilson, there is much good sense. "Where you say the Bereans are commended by the Holy Ghost, for *not* believing that which Paul spoke of religion, till they had examined by Scriptures, and seen whether the truth were so as he uttered, you speak not only unwisely and untruly, but if you would have *Christians* to follow that course, you show intolerable pride against the word of God: for the Bereans were commended (whereas yet they neither believed in Christ, nor acknowledged Paul's Apostleship) for their readiness *to hear*, and care to search, whether Paul spake true or no. This if now you assume to yourself over Paul's words or writings, you incur the crime of flat impiety. Paul's words to us that believe without further search or other credit, are of equal authority with the rest of the Scriptures, and not to believe him till we examine and see the truth of his doctrine is mere infidelity."[1]

There is only one other passage which can be urged by any sensible man in defence of the sufficiency of the Sacred Scripture, and that passage is the following: "But continue thou in those things which thou hast learned, and which have been committed to thee: knowing of whom thou hast learned them; and because from thy infancy thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, which can instruct thee to salvation, through (διὰ) the faith which is in Christ

[1] Survey of Christ's Sufferings, p. 84.

Jesus. All Scripture inspired by God is profitable to teach, to reprove, to correct, to instruct in justice, that the man of God may be perfect, furnished to every good work."[2] This is another of the texts on which Protestantism would erect its treacherous principle—a principle which seems to hold out great promises—pleasing blossoms indeed, but blossoms which are never destined to yield good fruit. But the more the text is examined the more reckless will those appear who use it as the prop and support of Protestantism. Take a survey of the Epistles of St. Paul to Timothy, and the deception will be manifest. 1° St. Paul tells his faithful disciple "to keep that which hath been committed to his trust;" 2° He bids him "hold fast the form of sound words," which he (Timothy) had heard from Paul, in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus:—"that good thing which was committed unto thee, keep by the Holy Ghost which dwelleth in us." 3° He tells him that heresies will arise, and thus he guards him against them: "Continue thou in the things *thou hast learned*, and hast been assured of, knowing of whom *ἀπ'ο τίνος* thou hast learned them" 4° He reminds him of his early knowledge of the Scriptures, a knowledge obviously derived from instruction because attained in infancy; and he informs him of the use of this knowledge "*through* the faith which is in Christ Jesus." The Old Testament then would be useful, but useful in consequence of the teaching of Paul and the belief in the faith of Jesus Christ. 5° Next, Timothy is addressed as *a man of God*, as one who had been raised to the height of the ministry; and it is stated that to him the Scripture will be "profitable for teaching, for reproving, &c." Such is the pas-

[2] 2 Tim. iii, 15 and seqq.

sage so confidently appealed to. But what does it prove? It is adduced in evidence of the solibiblical system: but is there even a glimmering, the faintest ray of light to lead us to such a conclusion? The Epistle is written to a minister of religion, and to one who had been carefully taught by St. Paul. The person addressed is warned to adhere to the form of sound words which he had heard, and thus still the vain babblings of proud men. The Scriptures are mentioned, but they are those of the Old Law; they are Scriptures whose meaning had been taught, Scriptures instructing to salvation but *by means of faith in Jesus Christ*, Scriptures profitable for the minister in many ways. This is stated in the objected passage, but this only. The assertions go not beyond the individual addressed or the order to which he belonged; and not one of them bears even lightly on the Protestant declaration—"*the Bible, and the Bible only, is the rule of Faith.*"

The sixteenth century system then, stands self-convicted. The Catholic reprobates it, 1° Because it is directly opposed to the positive injunction of Christ and the teaching of the one line of ministers which has come down from the Apostles to the present period. 2° He reprobates it because it has been made the ground, the root of all heresies. 3° He reprobates it because it puts rationalism and infidelity, the denial of all mysteries, even the great mystery of the Trinity and of the consubstantiality of the Son, on a par with the maintenance of the most blessed and God-sent truths. 4° He reprobates it, because it renders Christianity an absolute impossibility for 1440 years, and a moral impossibility for all after periods. 5° He reprobates it, because it treats God's written word with less

respect, than any Government, or even any scholar would allow either the laws of the realm or any able production to be treated. For would any Government make *any body and every body the judge of the laws?* Would it allow the decisions of the bold or the timid, of the ignorant or of the learned, to be conclusive of the question of the meaning of the law; or would each erring commentator be allowed to justify his aberrations of intellect or deflections from every principle of right interpretation on the ground of his having taken upon himself the character of an expositor. Would the merits of a Virgil's or a Homer's works, a Milton's, a Shakespeare's, or a Byron's, be allowed to depend by a discerning public on the decisions of the crowd. More, would the public be willing to declare, that all persons were qualified for the office of interpreters even of modern works, written in English and in England, and only for Englishmen. For example, would they be willing thus to test the intellectual worth of Wordsworth, or Southey, or even of Dickens? And shall it still be proclaimed that all men are to be held up as fitting interpreters of the awful volume whose characteristics we have already described at some length? 6° He reprobates it, because he sees the folly of allowing to each individual what is denied to the body of the Church by the Protestant; and of seeming to suppose that that could have been appointed as the medium of faith, which, being dependant on a thousand casualties, could not beget certainty in any one individual, much less in the mass of human beings around. I allude of course to the differences which do and must exist between man and man, in talent, in leisure, in facilities of obtaining information, &c. 7° He reprobates it, because its fruits are bad and bitter.

Under this system, unity of faith, Apostolicity and Catholicity are absolutely annulled: sanctity is destroyed; and instead of humility the worst kind of pride abounds. It has dried up the fountain of Sacramental graces; has caused the better gifts to be laughed at; has pillaged and plundered the temples and altars of the living God; has uttered words of blasphemy against every doctrine of Christ, and has made Christianity "a scandal to the Jews, and a folly to the Gentiles." 8° He reprobates it, in fine, because the Protestant thus *divides the divine word;* like the cruel Nestorian, making of one two—calling one *the Word of God*, and degrading the other to the level *of the offspring of the mere creature*, and calling it in derision *the Word of Man*, as if Christ's spoken word was not as holy as Apostles' written word, and as if *the writing* and not *the revelation* was the important matter to be considered *in the Word of God.*

Convinced of the necessity and institution of an ever enduring teaching authority in the Church, which is to teach all the days truth, we cannot be expected to submit to hear the Bible, which has been and is made the plaything of the fancy, by Protestants, called the only rule of faith. Lit up by a lunar ray, the imagination of the solibiblist soon gives signs of madness—signs which could only admit of a doubt in matters connected with religion;—delirious dreams are mistaken for revelations and the images of insanity for the apparitions of the spirit. If the Protestant wish to be the dupe of imagination, his principle will readily gratify his wishes; or if he wish to enter upon a voyage of religious discoveries, he may plunge with his Bible into the wide sea of controversy: but let him not therefore fancy that his are the wishes of others,

and that others have the same ideas of religious discoveries. The Catholic knows the region of revelation; the road, leading to it, is to him clear, well defined and well trodden down; he has his chart and his compass and a fixed light, ever guiding him to the Holy Land,—the land of truth, of certainty, of perfect peace. With these guides and with this end, he is perfectly contented.

It will hardly be required of me now, to shew the falseness of the assertion contained in the sixth Article, to wit, that "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation;" for already in the preceding pages the untenableness of the position has been demonstrated. Numerous articles of faith, articles of faith affecting nothing less than the Scriptures themselves, and the leading mysteries of religion, have been referred to as either not being contained in or not being proveable by the Sacred Scriptures, independently of an infallible exponent and guide. Texts which to some prove one thing, to another offer contradictory evidence; and he must be indeed ignorant who has not heard of the scores of interpretations which words simple as these,—"The Word was made flesh," "The Father is greater than I," "This is my body," "Whose sins you shall forgive they are forgiven,"—have received from able and diligent readers of Holy Writ. The list might be lengthened to nearly any extent. For the sake of brevity I will limit my observations on the thus unproved Articles of faith, admitted by Protestants, to the following. 1° The violation of the divine command to keep the Sabbath, and the sub-

stitution of the Sunday in its stead, without the warrantee of any scriptural injunction for the change. No where does the Scripture state that the Saturday is not to be kept holy; no where does it command the observance of the Sunday. It is silent, absolutely so, on this head: for I cannot suppose for a moment that any mortal possessed of mind sees either in the Resurrection of Christ, or in the reference to the holding on some occasions meetings on the first day of the week, either *a divine precept* to keep the Sunday holy, or a permission to labour and toil on the Sabbath. Further: it is no where written *how* the Christian seventh day is to be kept holy. The Christian does not keep it as the Jew did. He scruples not to light his fire and cook his dinner, and employ his servants in many works, as well as his horses and cattle. He measures not his steps, nor does he maintain that the divine threat has been uttered against such as attend not to the distance of the *Sabbath's journey*. "Thus far and no further," may, he says, regard the Jew, but it affects not the Christian. Protestant ministers, and Protestant laymen, enjoy a social feast on the Sunday as much as on the week day, and find railroads and carriages easy and convenient modes of transit, even upon the Lord's day. They may denounce innocent games in which the poor unite; they may affect to dread the sight of ball and bat, of cards and dice, and call their use a profanation *of the Sabbath*,—for to Judaize in this way is not uncommon,—but they see no harm in the bustle of the servant preparing the abundant repast; they find no sin either in making their beasts toil, or in journeying forth to some distant spot for air and exercise. But how is this? On what biblical principles do they proceed in consulting their appetites and tastes,

and ease and health, and in hurling their anathemas at the poor man, who, making neither servant nor beast toil, spends a few hours in unbending in invigorating sports, his overstrained body and cramped-up limbs. In a word, why does the Protestant write in letters of gold the words "Remember thou keep holy the *Sabbath day*," and teach that those words are *a divine command*, whilst he himself neither observes the *command* as to *time* or *circumstances*, nor intends others to observe the precept which he himself had enunciated, *as a heavenly ordinance.*

2° A still more important difficulty may be raised regarding *the validity of baptism given by heretics.* It is well known what a dispute was raised by St. Cyprian on this very point.[1] He maintained, and so did scores of African prelates, not to refer to those of other countries,[2] that Baptism was invalid unless administered by a sincere believer, by a member of the one Church. And what he maintained he endeavoured to prove. Scripture was cited by him, and cited with a facility peculiar to the talented and shrewd and learned prelate of Carthage; and such was the force of the passages cited and appealed to, that St. Austin honestly allows that he would have taken the side of the martyr of Carthage, had there existed no authority greater than that of St. Cyprian, for the exposition and certain interpretation of the written word.

That Christ commissioned *the Apostles* to confer the rite of Baptism is certain; and that he had the power to limit the commission to whatever extent he chose is indis-

[1] On the details and documentary evidence of this controversy, see Conte Giuseppe Recco's Dissertation in *Zaccaria's Storia Ecclesiastica*, vol. vii, p. 207, &c.; and Maleville's, ibid., vol. viii, p. 158.

[2] See *Tillemont*, note 44, on St. Cyprian.

putable; but that he never uttered a syllable which has been recorded in the Scriptures indicative of a wish to extend the ministerial privilege, is I think a fact beyond cavil. Further, since there *appears* at first sight something like an irregularity in the polity and economy of Christ, in the supposition that he made those out of his Church, the ministers of admission into the Church, those aliens from grace, the collators of the instrument of grace, one would rather infer with Cyprian that the administration of Baptism has been strictly confided to the Church, and that those out of the Church have no power over the property of the Church, than maintain with the orthodox that others, even those who were aliens to and enemies of the Church, had the power to touch the holy thing and give it to another. It seems to be tossing the pearl to swine and the holy things to dogs, to allow the privilege. And yet, on this point, the very Christianity of the world, if Protestantism be deserving of a moment's attention, turns. As we have noticed, the entire downfall of Christianity was requisite for the upheaving of English Protestantism. It required a moral deluge, to efface the idolatry and wickedness of the Catholic world, and begin a new system and order of things. The ark which bore along Boleyn, the parent of *spiritual* joys and blessings, and Henry, Cromwell, and Cranmer,—the Sem, Cham, and Japhet of Protestantism,—rode on the element of universal ruin. All flesh had corrupted its way: save HENRY and *his virtuous associates*, all were corrupt, and therefore came ruin. The record is heart-rending: "All men, women, and children, were at the moment, antecedent to the Reformation, and had been during the lengthened term of 800 years, Idolaters." How were these Idolaters

enabled to confer Baptism? Whatever baptism Henry or his had, that they had from Idolaters; or if they will, from the church of their condemnation. Were they baptized? If so, can it be proved that Idolaters can baptize? can it even be proved that the baptism of heretics is valid; nay, can it be even shewn, that by schism, the power is not forfeited. Can this be proved from Holy Writ? No: it cannot. Anglicans cannot shew on their own principles that there is one single Christian in the world; much less can they prove that there are any really ordained ministers, or that—Baptism being the gate through which admission is gained into the body of the Church—there is any Church at all. Let the impugners of Catholicity read the lengthened articles of Bingham, in his *Scholastic History of Baptism*;[1] they will feel the importance of the subject, and will not wonder at the earnestness of that writer, to demonstrate from tradition, that St. Stephen was right in his opinion and St. Cyprian wrong. The Pope's decisions, and the orthodoxy of Rome, are sometimes at least, of infinite service to our common Christianity!

It were easy indeed to urge the difficulties connected with Baptism further; for the validity of *infant* baptism, as is clear, cannot be *satisfactorily* proved—and anything less than a conclusive proof cannot satisfy the Christian where dogma is concerned—from Scripture; for the only passages bearing on Baptism *seem*, especially when contrasted with parallel passages of Holy Writ, to suppose reason and the power of election; nor can it be *shewn* that mere *aspersion* or *affusion* suffices for the validity of the baptismal rite: since the word βαπτίζω, as well as the

[1] I think that that is the title of the treatise, which I read about thirteen years ago; but to which I have not since had access.

mode of conferring Baptism undoubtedly made use of by the Apostles, and their successors in the ministry for ages,[1] involve the idea of immersion, or an actual and real plunging and burying, as it were, in the stream. But I pass over these and other matters, such as the denial by Calvin[2] and his of the necessity of using water at all, and of the denial by others of the form "I baptize thee in the name of the Father," &c.; being quite content with the more important and striking points already referred to.

3° Can even these three propositions of the Thirty-nine Articles be clearly established from the sacred Scriptures alone, 1° that *in the unity of the divine nature, there are three persons of the same essence, power, and eternity, the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit; 2° that the Son, who is the word of the Father, was begotten by the Father from eternity; and 3° that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son.*[3] I answer fearlessly that they cannot: nor will any person maintain the contradictory of this, who has ever read the Arian or Socinian or Greek controversies on these heads. The germs of doctrine which may be contained in the Scriptures on these subjects, require much development, ere they can be appreciated; and the mere reconciliation of Scripture with Scripture in reference to the Trinity, to the eternity of the Son, and the personality and procession of the Holy Spirit, is above the power of most scholars. Beyond reconciliation, much is required for the establishment of dogma; and that much as even Bull and greater men than that

[1] The ordinary mode of administering Baptism for nearly thirteen centuries, was *immersion.*

[2] Calvin interprets St. John iii, 5, by St. Matthew iii, 11.

[3] See Articles i, ii, and v.

Bishop have allowed, can only be supplied by an authority extrinsic to and in itself independent of, the Holy Scriptures. In the last century, even Anglicans and Protestant Bishops openly denied some or all of the points referred to. Let the reader consult Clark's[4] *Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity*, in which numerous Scriptureal citations are adduced in favour of Arianism, and in general refer to the controversy carried on between him and Waterland, which ended in rather confirming than weakening Clark's convictions; let him study the works of the famous mathematical professor of Cambridge, Whiston, who openly preached the heresy of Arius; or the *Essay of Spirit*[5] by Bishop Clayton, who went so far as to propose to the Irish House of Lords to expunge from the Liturgy the *Athanasian* and *Nicene Creeds*, and he will at once feel the difficulties by which, to these men's minds at least, the doctrines most sacred in Christianity, were surrounded; and he will further admit, that if Scripture alone be the rule of faith, then no mystery is safe, and Christianity is reduced to a name.

4° From the Scriptures alone, the 39th Article cannot be proved, which maintains the lawfulness of swearing: "We judge the *Christian* religion doth not prohibit, but that a man may swear when the magistrate requireth, in a cause of faith and charity, so it be done according to the prophet's teaching, in justice, judgment, and truth." Every one knows that numbers even at the present day

[4] He was Queen Anne's Chaplain, and in 1709 was presented to St. James', Westminster.

[5] Some persons maintain that Clayton only wrote the *Introduction* to the work. Still the point is the same: Clayton approved of the work and published it at his own expense. See Biog. Dict. *in verbo.*

object to swearing at all, looking on such an act as useless and strictly inhibited. And indeed, if the mere words of Christ be considered, "*Swear not at all . . . but let your communication be yea, yea, nay, nay, for* WHATSOEVER IS MORE THAN THESE COMETH OF EVIL;"[1] or the words of St. James: "*Above all things,* my brethren, swear not, neither by heaven, neither by the earth, neither by any other oath; but let your yea be yea, and your nay, nay; lest ye fall into condemnation,"[2] it will be indeed impossible to reconcile the Article with the Scriptures. *Private interpretations* are substituted for Holy Writ, and logical deductions for the divine declaration: and these are held up as God's word, though they are nothing else than the aberrations of ignorance and hallucinations of folly in the opinion of others who deny both the doctrines and deductions alluded to. It may be useful here to point out the usual way of proceeding adopted by Protestants in arguing from Holy Scripture; from my observations it will be made clear that the arguers either are impostors or grossly ignorant, and that those who believe in these texts *as interpreted* are sadly duped. I will prove my position by referring to a few leading articles of faith.

1° One of the points of religion which Protestants are particularly fond of attacking, is the doctrine of *the Intercessorship of the Saints.* This they absolutely deny, and in proof of their denial and of the Catholic doctrine being anti-Scriptural, they refer to two well-known texts, to 1 *Tim.* ii, 5, and 1 *St. John* ii, 1, 2. Is it not written, they say, "there is one mediator of God and man, the man Christ Jesus." In order to convince the reader that these words bear not in fact upon the point of doctrine attacked,

[1] Matt. v, 34, &c. [2] St. James v, 12.

and to show how here as elsewhere the Scripture is corrupted for an end, I will cite the entire text. "God," says St. Paul, "wills that all men be saved, and that they come to the knowledge of the truth. *For there is one God*, one mediator of God and man, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a redemption for all." Now, in this text not a word occurs, 1° relative to *mere* advocates and intercessors before the throne of God. The text of Scripture speaks of one *mediator;* and the solibiblist goes beyond the Scripture in saying that this word means intercessor, such as the saints are said to be by the Catholics. That is *his* comment, his interpretation, it is not the word of God; and God's word, not man's word, is or is said to be the Protestant rule of faith. 2° I assert further that plainly the meaning, assigned by the Protestant, is in direct opposition to the text of Scripture. St. Paul speaks of *one mediator who gave himself a redemption for all:* he speaks of a redeemer not of an intercessor simply, of one who has offered up himself as the ransom for the sins of mankind, and not of one who simply prays that the ransom offered for man may be applied to man. And really can any Protestant be so grossly ignorant as not to know that even Moses is called emphatically by St. Paul *a mediator* (Gal. iii, 19). It should, however, be noticed that the Church does not apply in her conciliary decrees the title of mediator to the saints, out of respect to Him who is emphatically the mediator of man and God.

The second text, 1 St. John ii, 1, 2, is equally inconclusive. "I write," says St. John, "to you that you may not sin. But if any one sin we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the just; *and he is the propitiation*

for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for those of the whole world." Does not this passage 1° obviously speak of an advocate who is the propitiation for the sins of the world; and if it do, is it not clearly beside the question? For does the Protestant think that we admit two advocates of this character, one of whom is God and the other a mere creature? No. But 2° put the case that the Protestant will obstinately apply the text to Christ simply as *an* advocate, and not as *the* advocate who is the Redeemer too, what will he gain? Nothing. Does the Catholic deny that Christ *is* an advocate, and *the* advocate emphatically? Again, I answer no. For ever, is he the great advocate, the advocate to whom saints appeal, and from whom they obtain those favours for mankind which Christ in his mercy is pleased to give. He is the eternal advocate—the God-man; the saints are mere creatures interceding. The text if taken in the only sense—a sense, however, inadmissible—in which it can be twisted into an argument even by the sophist, is useless; for whilst it includes positively Christ, it excludes none from the office of advocate. Allow Christ to be an advocate, and as far as advocacy is concerned, as much has been admitted as is asserted in the text.

As another illustration, let us review the proofs of the assertion of the eleventh Article: "*Wherefore that we are* JUSTIFIED BY FAITH ONLY *is a most wholesome doctrine.*" They are taken 1° from Romans iii, 22, 28, Galatians ii, 16, and v, 6, Eph. ii, 8; and 2° from St. John's Gospel iii, 15, 16, &c. Now where 1° in these passages, or in any other available passage of Holy Writ, is it stated that man is justified by *faith* ONLY. That faith is the root, the

principle of justification is distinctly taught by the Council of Trent,[1] that without faith it is impossible to please God, and that he who believes not will be condemned, is again admitted; but still I seek in vain for either of these propositions that "faith alone suffices for salvation," and that "it only justifies." 2° St. Paul, in the passages cited, as well as elsewhere, argues strenuously in maintenance of this truth, that Christians are not justified either by circumcision or by the Judaical observances. Some converts seemed to be anxious to unite to the faith of Christianity the observances of Judaism; *these* St. Paul opposes not incidentally, as it were, but at great length; devoting five long chapters to the establishment of his position and the overthrow of the rites of the Synagogue. "Behold," he says, "I Paul tell you, that if you be circumcised, Christ will profit you nothing. And I testify again to every man circumcising himself that he is a debtor to do the whole law. You are made void of Christ, you who are justified in the law; you are fallen from grace. For we in spirit by faith, wait for the hope of justice. For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything nor uncircumcision; *but faith that worketh by charity.*"[2] And indeed, that this was the sense of St. Paul is admitted by Pretyman himself in his explanation of the eleventh Article of Anglicanism.[3] Nay more, he goes further. He shows how these words misunderstood were made the basis of the error "that faith in Christ, without works or deeds of any kind, that is, without the practice of moral virtue, was of itself sufficient to procure salvation,"[4] and how St. James "reprobated and refuted the aforesaid interpretation, by proving that a man is justified *by his works,* and not by

[1] Sess. vi, c. 8. [2] Galatians v, 2, 6. [3] Vol. ii, 261. [4] *Ibid.*

faith only. . . . When, therefore, he says that a man is not justified by faith only, he means that a man is not justified by a bare belief of the divine mission of Christ; that belief must be accompanied by obedience, or it will be ineffectual, that is, as he says in another place, 'Faith without works is dead.'"

Hence it appears that the words *faith* and *works* are used in different senses by St. Paul and by St. James. St. Paul puts faith for the whole of Christianity, in contradistinction to the law of Moses; and the works which he declares to be unnecessary for justification are the rites and ceremonies of that law. On the other hand, by faith St. James means a bare assent to the truth in the Gospel; and the works which he declares necessary for justification are the moral duties enjoined by the Gospel, and which are produced by faith. St. Paul therefore says, the religion of Christ, if believed and obeyed, is sufficient to justify. St. James says, the bare belief of the religion of Christ, without conformity to its precepts, is not sufficient to justify. These two propositions are perfectly consistent with each other; and the seeming contradiction in the passages themselves, arises from the circumstance just now noticed, namely, that the two Apostles in reasoning against different errors, use the same words in different senses. We may observe, in confirmation of our having rightly explained St. Paul's meaning of the word *faith*, that every one of his Epistles abounds with the most earnest exhortations and strict injunctions to the practice of the moral duties, as forming an essential part of the Christian character, and as absolutely indispensable to salvation; and in his Epistle to the Romans, he expressly says, that "God will render to every man according to his works;

tribulation and anguish unto every soul of man that doeth evil, and glory, and honour, and peace to every man that worketh good;" and that "not the hearers of the law shall be just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified." The word faith in this Article is used in the same sense in which St. Paul uses it."[1] So then, after all, faith only or alone does *not* justify; for obviously *faith* is something less extensive than *faith with works*, with *its fruits*. That faith can exist alone is clear; that belief does not necessitate man and deprive him of the power of choosing evil and of acting against the conviction of his mind is equally clear; then faith *working by charity*, as St. Paul denominates justifying faith, that faith which is obeyed and not practically slighted, is something very different from mere faith to which St. Paul thus refers in his useful and important letter to the Corinthians: "If I had faith to move mountains . . . and had not charity, I am nothing."[2] Since, then, this faith alone does not justify, the Article is proved to be false, and the arguments adduced in favour of the Protestant position are obviously null and void. In fact, who can remember the words of Christ in reference to the last day, "He shall render to every man according to his works,"[3] or those others of St. Peter, "Wherefore, brethren, labour the more, that by good works, you may make your calling and election sure,"[4] and those of St. James, "What shall it profit, my brethren, if a man say he hath faith, but hath not works? Shall faith be able to save him? Faith, if it hath not works, is dead in itself,"[5] and not see clearly that the statement contained in the Article is as much opposed

[1] Pretyman, vol. ii, p. 263-4. [2] 1 Cor. xiii. [3] Matt. xvi, 27.
[4] 2 Peter i, 10. [5] James ii, 14, 17.

to the Scriptures as it is to common sense. Pretyman's explanation and reconciliation is indeed sufficiently Catholic; but it is a suicidal act in a Protestant to adopt such language, and append it, moreover, to the eleventh Article. The eleventh Article does maintain the solifidian system; and in this sense was it originally defended by the reformers. It is to repudiate the Article, to maintain that faith only justifies when *accompanied by good works.*

Nor is the citation from St. John more conclusive. For 1° the word *only* no where occurs in the passage adduced in relation to faith. 2° The words "*believe in Christ*" do not in the passage quoted, or in numbers of other places, simply mean a knowledge of the truths of Christianity, but a practical knowledge, or as St. Paul calls it, "a faith working by charity," or an operative and effective faith, a faith which is not contradicted by deeds. This is evident from the whole system of Christianity—a system which perfects in this and in other matters reason and common sense; and does not contradict them, by stating that knowledge is all with God, and that he wholly disregards the agreement of belief and practice as a principle of morality, and a condition of salvation.[1]

I have already shown, too, how the first principle of Protestantism is not proveable from the Scriptures. For 1° neither the inspiration, nor the genuineness, nor the authenticity, nor the canonicity of the sacred books can be demonstrated from Scripture. 2° The Scriptures no where say that they contain all truth; nor 3° do they assert that the Bible is the only rule of faith. This has been already shown. And whoever will read the passages commonly cited, "*Thy word is a lamp to my*

[1] See 1 John iii, 15, and seqq. *as also the Gospels passim.*

feet," "*The word of the Lord remaineth for ever.*" "These," (signs σημεῖα,) "are written, that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the son of God; and that believing. you may have life in his name," will at once admit the irrelevancy of such citations. They neither refer to the Scriptures of the new law, nor to the *Scriptures* in general; nor do they remotely assert that the Scriptures contain all truth, and that they are the only rule of and guide to faith. Having, however, in detail, shown to the reader the inapplicability of such passages, I deem it useless to go back to the subject again.

Let any doctrine, indeed, advocated by Protestantism be fairly sifted, and it will be found eventually that it is not proved by Scripture only. Had not *homilies* and *articles* and *prayer-book*, or *catechism*, sermons and oral instruction suggested or rather enunciated certain truths as divine, and pointed to certain words of Holy Writ as God's declaration in their favour, the Protestant would not have hit upon his system more than upon any other. Texts seemingly opposed to texts, not to refer to the consciousness of an inability to decide on questions which for centuries have divided Christendom, here and elsewhere, would have left his mind a moral blank: he might have become a Pyrrhonist or sceptic, as Blanco White, and Chillingworth, not to mention still greater names, became —but he might not have become a Protestant or a discoverer of the thirty-nine Articles in the Sacred Scriptures.

From what has been said the reader will have deduced a few consequences of great importance to the Catholic. 1° He will have inferred that Catholics do not receive the Protestant principle, because they look upon it as false,

and destructive of morality, of faith, and of that authority which Christ has bid man hear, and which conveys to mankind not simply the letter, but the heavenly interpretation. Protestants are satisfied with the heavenly hand-writing, מכא הקל ופרסום ; the Catholic requires the heaven-aided interpreter, in order to be assured of the hidden mystery. The one divides the word, the other receives the whole ; believing that not the writing but the inspiration, the revelation howsoever communicated, be the mode writing, or be the mode speaking, is the only important item to be considered. 2° Hence, again, he will infer how unjust it is to state as Protestants do state, that therefore does the Catholic refuse to be judged by the Bible, because he shuns the light, rejects God's word, and knows that the Bible and Catholicity are irreconcileable. All this is neither more nor less than an unmitigated untruth, although generally credited. No such motives do, or could reasonably be supposed to actuate the Catholic. He refuses on higher motives, on motives, as sacred indeed to him as Christianity itself, to receive the *divided* word as the source of all truth, and the sole guide to orthodoxy. He believes that God has appointed not a book, but a living, teaching, infallible authority to be the means of arriving at the knowledge of His revelations ; and hence this and not that is the authority by which he abides. He has no choice : God has chosen and ruled all beforehand ; and to his decision he willingly clings, notwithstanding the scoffs and insults and jeers of a deluded crowd. Ignorant of the principle of salvation, the scoffer may look upon it as a sign of impotence and error to be attached to it : he may say " descendat de cruce," let the Catholic abandon his

condemned position: but the Catholic will not do so: for that which is scorned is the election of Christ, who is *the wisdom and the power of God.*

Nor can any one suppose, who really thinks, that anything less than evidence could bind a Catholic to his principles. For what is the position of the Catholic here? Is it not one of suffering, of incessant hardship and persecution? Is not his a religion full of restraints on passion and carnal desires? Is not his a nearly hopeless life as far as secular advantages are concerned? Let the reader call to mind what is written in the statute-book against us; let him see what we have been deprived of, and to what privations we were subjected for centuries; let him see how crippled is our religion down to the present hour, even the ministers of religion being forbidden to appear in public in the robes of religion under penalties, no marriage being *lawful* unless in the presence of a registrar, and the minister of another creed claiming even the power—a power which is exercised, too—to insult us by reading prayers over our dead; let him remember the hatred recently displayed against us, and the bitterness felt towards us, a bitterness which manifests itself in tracts, in circulating defamers, male and female, and in the pulpits of the establishment where nothing is too outrageous for assertion in the presence of hundreds on hundreds of witnesses; let him, in fine, remember how nearly every civil post of emolument is conferred on Protestants, and that the Catholic minister must be content to lead a life of hardship and of poverty, hardship as great and poverty as pinching as Apostles themselves had to endure, and he will allow that the accusation of recklessness is indeed reckless, and that indifference on our parts to truth, or a wilful oppo-

sition to it, is inexplicable under existing circumstances, on any hitherto discovered principles of psychology. "I have believed, therefore have I spoken," is the Catholic answer to the enquirer about his motives for adhering to this rather than to that principle; and for being a member rather of Catholicity than of Protestantism —easy, luxurious, wealthy, unrestrained Protestantism. "*I have believed.*"

Chapter the Tenth.

On the Zeal of Catholics in Transcribing and Circulating the Sacred Scriptures, and the Grounds of Opposition to the Bible Society.

CONTENTS.

Catholic Zeal in Transcribing, Translating, and Spreading the Sacred Scriptures, attested by Protestants, and evidenced by a Multiplicity of Manuscripts in the various Libraries of Europe, &c.—Continuation and Extension of this Zeal after the Discovery of the Art of Printing.—Bibles published in every Ancient and nearly every Modern Language.—Continuous proofs of this point.—Zeal and favour of the Popes.—Catholic Commentators as contrasted with Protestant Annotators.—Origin of the Protestant Idea respecting Catholic Opposition to the Scriptures.—Origin of the Index, and History of the Fourth Rule.—This Rule both Wise and Truthful, and conformable to the Apostolic Teaching.—Even Protestants approve of the Principle advocated in the Fourth Rule.—Modification of the Rule under altered circumstances.—Causes of the Opposition of the Pontiffs to the Bible Society.—These Causes just and commendable.—Antagonism of the Members of the Bible Society.—This Antagonism clearly demonstrated.—Conclusion.

In order to poison the public mind, the enemies of Catholicity incessantly repeat the cry that we are opposed to the written word. They would have the people believe that to them the world is indebted for the Bible; that to others

it is a sealed, an inhibited book; and that, therefore, does Rome condemn the Bible Societies, because Rome is opposed to the Bible. Need I tell any scholar, that here there are as many misrepresentations as ideas? But all are not scholars: for the benefit of such as are not, I will briefly expose the calumny.

1° The world is *not* indebted to Protestantism for the Bible. Long before this religion was heard of, the Bible was known, and circulated in the languages of Greece and Rome. It was circulated in these languages so long as they were the languages of civilization and of literature. Earnestly and devotedly did Catholics toil and labour in transcribing the sacred volumes; and so great was the number of copies thus produced by manual labour, one by one, that there was no country, no city, no cathedral or monastic establishment which was not possessed of the Bible. Each copy became the parent of others; and the amount of Bibles existing prior to the discovery of printing will appear really wonderful to any one who bears in mind the labour and expense of transcription. "The Bible, it is true, was," as Merryweather observes, "an expensive work, but it can scarcely be regarded as a rare one; the monastery was indeed poor that had it not, and when once obtained the monks took care to speedily transcribe it. Sometimes they only possessed detached portions, but when this was the case they generally borrowed of some neighbouring and more fortunate monastery the missing parts to transcribe, and so complete their own copies."[1] "Occasionally I have met with instances where, besides several *Biblia optima*, the monasteries enjoyed Hebrew codices and translations, and numerous copies of the

[1] Merryweather's Bibliomania in the Middle Ages, p. 24.

Gospels. We must not forget, however, that the transcription of a Bible was a work of time, and required the outlay of much industry and wealth. Brother Tedynton, a monk of Ely, commenced a Bible in 1396, and was several years before he completed it. The magnitude of the undertaking can scarcely be imagined by those unpractised in the art of copying; but when this monk saw the long labour of his pen before him, and looked upon the well-bound strong clasped volumes, with their clean vellum folios and fine illuminations, he seemed well repaid for his years of toil and tedious labour. . . . . Kings and nobles offered the Bible as an appropriate and generous gift, and bishops were deemed benefactors to their Church by adding it to the library."[2] And, indeed, whoever is acquainted with the works of Griesbach, Bentley, Michaelis, Mill, Simon, Kennicott, Wetstein, Blanchini, and Scholz on the numerous manuscripts of the Sacred Scripture; whoever has directed his attention to the manuscript collections of the Bible in the Vatican, Ambrosian and Magliabecchian libraries in Italy, and to those which France possesses in the Mazarin, St. Genevieve, and royal libraries of Paris; whoever has visited the libraries of Venice, of Vienna, Stuttgard, and Göttingen, or those of the Bodleian and British Museum, or of Trinity College, Dublin; not to refer at greater length to the various col-

[2] Ibid, 26, 27. Several striking remarks on the subject in hand may be seen in the same work at pp. 54, 61, 68, 70, 88, 97, 109, 119, 130, 131, 133, 140, 158-9, 161, 177, and seqq. Dr. Maitland in his "*Dark Ages*" has anticipated Merryweather's remarks. So far from discovering that the Bible was an unknown book, he maintains that the evidence is all the other way; and he lashes D'Aubigny for his insensate ignorance or bigotry, or both.

lections which exist in nearly every city in Europe;[1] whoever has read the writings of the bishops, priests, monks, and lay historians of the middle and previous ages down to the era of the discovery of printing; nay more, whoever is acquainted with even the plays and the mysteries enacted here and elsewhere, will be struck by the amount of toil displayed in copying, in circulating, in studying, and in interpreting the sacred word.[2]

Nor did this zeal cease with the discovery of printing,—a discovery, like most others, by which society has been so greatly benefited,—made by Catholics.[3] Hallam proves that the Bible was the first book printed (Hist. of Literature, vol. i, p. 96), and soon it was published in nearly every language. In the year 1488, a complete edition of the Bible in Hebrew appeared at Soncino, in the Cremonese territory in the duchy of Milan; and at Brescia in 1494. This edition was made use of by Luther (See I. G. Palm. de codicibus quibus Lutherus usus est). Soon, too,

[1] See De Rossis' *Variæ Lectiones* for a complete list of Hebrew MSS.; also Kennicott's *Dissertatio præliminaris*, and the seventh and following volumes of the *Classical Journal*, for a list of the same class of MSS. existing in Britain at the present period. About the Greek MSS. the reader may receive much information from Griesbach, Bentley, and Scholz; and Le Long, Blanchini, &c., may be usefully consulted in reference to the old MSS. in other languages.

[2] For an account of the reverence formerly shown to the Holy Scriptures, and the care and expense lavished on the Bible, the reader may consult Zaccaria, Dissertatione di Storia Eccles. vol. vii, 276.

[3] The observations of his Eminence Cardinal Wiseman, regarding *one class* of discoveries and *by one country*, have been *too much* for Protestant England. Hence the comments on his speech at Leeds, but *without the text*. I might add, that Father Fabri, S.J, was *unquestionably* the discoverer of the circulation of the blood. See *Paulian's Dict. de Physique. Art. Fabri.*

a Cardinal, Cardinal Ximenes, undertook the expensive and unprecedented task of printing a polyglott. The printing of it commenced in 1504, and was happily terminated in 1517. This polyglott contains an independent Hebrew text, which became the basis of several other editions, as also *the Septuagint, the Vulgate,* and a Chaldee paraphrase. The New Testament contains the Greek text and the Latin Vulgate. This noble work, worthy of the proudest sovereign of Europe, was undertaken by a Cardinal, and was dedicated to the patron of learned men, Leo X. It was in six volumes, folio. The example of Ximenes was a stimulus to others. In 1569—1572, appeared the Antwerp polyglott, in eight volumes, folio; Philip II, King of Spain, defraying the expenses of this colossal undertaking. In addition to the text of the Complutensian polyglott, were added another Chaldee paraphrase of a part of the Old Testament, a Syriac version of the New Testament, and the Latin translation of Pagninus amended by the editor *Arias Montanus.* Nor did the impulse end here. The Parisian polyglott appeared in 1628—1645 in ten volumes, folio. The work was undertaken at the expense of a Catholic layman, who afterwards became a Priest, of the name of Guido Michael le Jay. It comprises all that had previously been published in the two Catholic polyglotts, but has in addition an Arabic version of the Old and New Testament, a Syriac version likewise of the Old Testament, and the Samaritan Pentateuch.

After such a reference to zeal, reckless of expense and toil, it will be nearly useless to allude to any ordinary undertaking in connexion with the publication of the Greek and Latin Scriptures. Suffice it then to say, that the Aldine edition of the *Septuagint* appeared at Venice

in 1518, and the Roman after the Vatican Codex, in 1586. Of the early printing of the Latin text, the following observation, made by a learned Protestant, offers sufficient evidence: "After the invention of printing, the Latin Bible was the first considerable work that was sent to the press." Afterwards, editions of a critical character were published in Paris in 1528, 1532, 1534, 1540, &c.; at Louvain in 1547; at Antwerp in 1565 and 1574, and again at Louvain in 1573 and 1586. Rome issued a splendid edition in 1592, and as every one knows, hardly is there a country which has not published numerous editions of this authorised version, which has been uniformly used in disputations, in preaching, and in expositions of the sacred text, during the last two hundred and sixty years.[1]

But were there translations of the Scripture in the vernacular tongues? Translations? Yes indeed—there were translations in abundance in manuscript before the art of printing was discovered, and after this invention had been rendered generally available, copies were struck off by thousands, in nearly every language of civilized Europe. To this point I will briefly draw the reader's attention, for to many the subject may prove both novel and highly instructive, and corrective of prejudices which have been carefully propagated by Protestants.

1° *German Bibles.* The first translation of the Bible into German, is that of Ulphilas, Bishop of the Goths, about the year 360. Only portions of this translation are known to exist; but it is not improbable that in course of time the entire translation may be discovered. The student knows that down to the year 1819, only two manuscripts

[1] See Le Long, l. c., and De Bure's "Bibliographie Instructive," i, 32, 69.

of this translation had been discovered, one of which is preserved at Upsal in Sweden, and is called the *Codex Argenteus*,[2] from its silver letters, which are written on vellum of a violet colour, whilst the other, which Knittel discovered in 1756, is to be found in the library of the Duke of Brunswick at Wolfenbüttel.[3] But in 1819, the illustrious Cardinal Mai discovered on several palimpsests the following Epistles: the Epistle to the Romans, the first and second to the Corinthians, the first and second to the Thessalonians, those to the Galatians, Philippians, Colossians, and Ephesians; the first and second to Timothy; and the Epistles to Titus and Philemon. Besides, there were two pages of Esdras, and four of Nehemias; and abundant proofs in addition, that the common belief that Ulphilas had not translated the books of Kings, for fear of enkindling the martial fury of the Goths, was altogether unfounded.[4] As Hallam rightly observes: "In the eighth and ninth centuries, when the Latin Vulgate had ceased to be generally understood, there is no reason to suspect any intention in the Church of Rome, to deprive the laity of the Scriptures. Translations were freely made. . . . . Louis le Debonnaire is said to have caused a German version of the New Testament to be made. Olfrid, in the ninth century, rendered the Gospels, or rather abridged them into German verse."[5] . . . .

[2] It was found in the abbey of Werden, in Westphalia. This MS. contains the four Gospels, but with numerous and important lacunæ.

[3] The best edition of all these fragments of Ulphilas is that of Zahn, published at Weissenfels in 1805.

[4] See Mai's "Ulphilæ partium ineditarum in Ambrosianis palimpsestis ab A. Maio repertarum, specimen." *Mediolani* 1819.

[5] *View of Europe during the Middle Ages*, p. 58, &c.

Besides these, numerous manuscripts of every age exist, through which the changes affecting the German language may be distinctly traced. It is natural to suppose that in the country where printing was discovered, the Bible would soon appear in print. The first printed Bible extant is that of Nuremberg, 1447, and a second appeared in 1466; but the names of the authors of both editions are undiscovered. The edition of 1466 was so frequently and rapidly reprinted, that prior to the publication of Luther's Bible, it had been issued no fewer than sixteen times: once at Strasburg, five times at Nuremberg, and ten times at Augsburg. Three distinct editions too appeared at Wittemberg in 1470, 1483, and 1490;[1] so that before Luther was heard of or even born, the Bible, judging from the numerous editions published, must have been well known and well read.[2] Judge then of the audacity of a modern writer, D'Aubigny, who has dared to insult the public, by stating that "the Bible was an unknown book" in the year 1517, and that Luther had never seen it till his twentieth year![3] And yet has not the inaccurate Horne, who though an authority with Anglicans is one of the most unsatisfactory writers either on the *proofs*[4] of Scripture or on the mere facts connected with manuscripts and printed copies, given his sanction to this

[1] See Seckendorf's Comment in Luther, p. 204.

[2] Le Long's Bib. Sac. t. i, p. 354 and seqq. Audin's Life of Luther, p. 266; and the Dublin Review, No. 2, July 1836, p. 378, &c., may be consulted on the printed editions.

[3] Hist. of Reformation, vol. i, p. 131.

[4] I find that several authors have recently expressed regret on finding *such* a man using the feeble arguments he does in reference to the *Inspiration*, &c., of the Sacred text. Horne's day is over: and his Introduction will be hereafter, in the eyes of scholars, in very truth only a *Horn-book*.

error, by suppressing all reference to the numerous editions which preceded Luther, though he had Le Long's work before him to teach him better?

The zeal of German Catholics has ever remained the same, for the sacred writings: and Protestants have admitted the singular merits of the more modern Catholic versions of Schwarzel and Brentano and Allioli. These men, and men like them, preserve the integrity of books and text, whilst thousands of others in Germany are lopping away book after book, and reducing the whole to a myth:—a Bible without revelation, or mystery, or miracle!

2° *French Bibles.* *Simon* observes, in reference to this class of translations, that "it is affirmed in France that part of the Bible was translated into French under Charles the 5th of France; and M. Charles du Moulin declares that he had seen some manuscript fragments of it. Besides, they of Geneva have at present in their public library a French translation of the whole Bible, made by a Canon of Aire towards the end of the thirteenth century. I believe this to be the same translation which Robert Olivetan speaks of, and which was read at Geneva before Calvin's reformation, who set up another in its place."[5] Besides the "Bible historiale" of Des Moulins, which appeared about 1478, and which was reprinted sixteen times prior to 1546, twelve editions being printed at Paris and four at Lyons, Le Fevre published an edition of the sacred Scriptures in 1512. Edition after edition eventually appeared, as may be seen in *Simon's* writings on the Scriptures; and no one can be ignorant of the merits and circulation of the

[5] *Simon's Hist. Crit. du V. T.* Book ii, c. 22.

translations of De Sacy, Corbin, Amelotte, Maralles, Godeau, and Hurè.

3° *Flemish Bibles.* Before 1210, the Bible was translated into Flemish, if we may rely on the authority of Usher, by James Merland. In the Bodleian there is a manuscript of the date of 1472. Eventually, as even the writer in the Encyclopædia Britannica allows, the Flemish Bibles of the Catholics became very numerous, though printed in general without the authors' names down to the year 1548, when Vinck[1] published his translation at Louvain. The first printed edition appeared at Cologne in 1475, and was reprinted at least seven times before 1530, whilst the edition of Antwerp, of 1528, was reprinted eight times in seventeen years. The later editions of De Witt, Laemput, and Schurr, testify as well to the biblical knowledge as to the piety of the learned Catholics of Flanders.

4° *Spanish Bibles.* But had the Spaniards any copies formerly of the sacred Scriptures? Yes. And, not to refer to older versions, for this is in fact useless, in 1405 the whole Bible was translated either by St. Vincent Ferrer or by his brother Boniface. This translation was printed at Valencia in 1478, with the formal permission of the Inquisition, and reprinted in 1515,[2] and of it numerous editions were published at Antwerp, Barcelona, and Madrid, Eventually, however, it was superseded by the labours of Scio de S. Miguel, whose translation has

[1] Article, *Bible.* Others call this person Van Wingh; which is indeed the correct mode of writing his name.

[2] See *Simon*, l. c., and *Dublin Review*, l. c. Simon refers to De Valere for his statement.

been republished even by Bagster in 1823, on account of its elegance and fidelity.

5° *Italian Bibles.* As early as 1290, Jacobus à Voragine, one of the lengthened line of illustrious Archbishops who have ruled the see of Genoa, published the entire Bible in Italian. Another translation was prepared by the Camaldolese Monk, Nicholas Malermi, which was printed at Venice in 1471, and again in Rome in the same year, but with considerable alterations. It was so eagerly purchased, that prior to the year 1525, no fewer than thirteen editions of it had issued from the press. They were all published with the permission of the Inquisition, as were also eight other editions which were printed before the year 1567. The most approved and accurate edition, however, of the Scriptures was executed by the Archbishop of Florence, Martini. The New Testament was published in 1769, and the Old in 1779. During the last seventy years, this copy has been reprinted in every size, scores of times. It was hailed by the head of the Catholic Church, Pius VI, as well as by the rest of the Italians. The Pontiff praised the zeal and ability of the translator in a letter which is now ordinarily prefixed to the English Catholic versions of the Scriptures,[3] and exhorted the faithful to avail themselves of the fruits of the learning and industry of the venerable Archbishop.

6° *English versions.* Owing to the change of dynasty and language, which was so frequent here, it will afford little matter for surprise, if comparatively few editions of the sacred Scriptures appeared in the vernacular. Briton

[3] See for example the Bible dedicated to Dr. Brampston, in fol.; the Testament published in Belfast, Duffy's Bibles, &c. On the Italian versions see the Dublin Review, l. c.

and Saxon, Dane and Norman, rapidly succeeded one another, and even long after the establishment of the Norman power, the language of France was considered the language of civilization, and together with Latin, of law and literature. Still, that parts at least of the sacred Scriptures were translated into Saxon, is certain; for Venerable Beda was occupied in dictating his translation of the Gospel of St. John, down to a few hours before his saintly death. To what extent, however, his labours went is a matter of great uncertainty; for whilst some maintain that he only translated the Gospels, others as positively assert, that the Saxons were indebted to him for a version of the whole of the sacred Scriptures. In the Cottonian library at the British Museum there are two Saxon manuscripts; one containing the Psalms, the other the sacred Gospels. The *Rushworth Gloss* at Oxford, too, contains the Gospels. Besides these, there are still numerous manuscripts remaining,[1] in which occur translations of various portions of the Bible. By Ælfric the homelist, a very considerable portion of the sacred Scriptures was translated, at the entreaty of his patron Ethelwœrd. This Ethelwœrd had an imperfect copy of an English version of Genesis, which he was anxious to see completed; and judging that no one was more fitted for the task than Ælfric, him he asked to gratify his wishes. Other circumstances impelled Ælfric to prosecute his task; and it is quite clear, that very few books indeed of the

[1] Of the wanton destruction of British manuscripts by the Saxons, and of the Saxon by the Danes, no one is ignorant. But the English manuscripts were equally recklessly destroyed at the Reformation. Ship loads were sold as waste-paper, and those which were not sent to the Continent were torn to pieces. See Leland's, &c. account of this sad event.

Scriptures escaped his attention.[2] Usher and Wood are positive that Trevisa published a translation of the whole of the Bible. Assuredly, as Sir Thomas More remarks, there was a translation in English which anticipated that of the inconsistent and vacillating and disappointed Wycliffe. In 1582 the New Testament was published at Rheims, from the MS. of Allen, Martin, and Bristow, and the Old Testament was completed at Douay in 1609, 1610. Numerous editions, more or less corrected and amended, have been published of the entire Bible by the Catholics, in England, Ireland, and Scotland; and notwithstanding the numerous difficulties by which we are surrounded, our Bibles, though considerably larger than those circulated by the Protestants, and not printed at a price ruinous to all engaged on the work,[3] are now nearly as cheap as those sold by the various branches of Protestantism.

When further it is remembered that the first Christian edition of the Samaritan Pentateuch was published by Catholics; that they were the first, too, to print and spread far and wide the Greek, Arabic, Syrian, and Æthiopic versions, and the Chaldean paraphrases; that copies innumerable of the Bible, in the language best understood by all scholars, have been circulated by them—of course I refer to the publication of the Vulgate; when, again, it

[2] See Lingard's interesting account of the whole proceeding, *in his Anglo-Saxon Church, vol.* ii, 315 *and seq.;* as also Merryweather, l. c., p. 48-9.

[3] The reader will remember the said exposé of the system pursued towards printers, &c., engaged on the Bibles of the Bible Society. It was proved that the most cruel conduct was pursued towards the workmen and workwomen; and that the Bible maxim, "The workman is worthy of his hire," was entirely overlooked.

is remembered that from the Propaganda Press at Rome, Bibles or portions of Bibles have issued in the languages of one hundred and sixty-three different peoples (*See Kinsella's Letters*, p. 28); that Houbigant was rewarded by a Pope for his biblical researches; that Kennicott obtained in the Vatican that assistance which enabled him to publish his critical work at the Clarendon Press in 1776; and that men like Rossi have spent their lives over the palimpsest, and others like Fabricy have written volume on volume to stimulate the learned to labour hard in their Bible task; when, in fine, it is felt and known, as it should be, by every scholar, that to the Catholics the world is indebted not only for the letter of the Scripture, but also for every kind of commentary which may facilitate the acquirement of a thorough knowledge of the text, whether that knowledge regard the *readings*, the *topography*, the *chronology*, the *customs*, the *currency*, the *royal* or *sacerdotal duties*, the *faith and practices of the believer or of the infidel, the natural history* contained in the sacred pages, or *the history of kingdoms and dynasties*, of *nations* and *individuals* long since passed away;—and are not the works of Petau, Ribera, Pineda, Ugolini, A. Lapide, Menochius, Bonfrere, Tirinus, Salianus, Pradus and Villalpandus, Agelli, Justiniani, Lamy, Houbigant, Celada, Maldonatus, Estius, Cajetan, Toletus, Mariana, De Sacy, Calmet, Ackermann, Windischmann, Secchi, Patrizzi, and Scholz illustrative of the sacred history, of European celebrity?—can any one hereafter be so reckless of truth or so anxious to stultify himself in the eyes of every respectable man, as to assert that Catholicity is, I will not say inimical to the Scriptures, but not anxious in every available way to show her esteem and reverence

for, and knowledge of, the sacred volumes in all their details. Puny are the efforts, notwithstanding all modern boastings, of Protestantism, when compared with those of Catholicity, in reference to the Bible; and were those who either speak against or who ignore the claims of our authors to zeal and knowledge, stripped of their borrowed plumes; were the writers on the Psalms—Horne and others—compared with Agelli and Bellarmine; the modern commentators on Job examined by the side of Pineda, and those on Ezechiel contrasted with the refined and learned observations of Pradus and Villalpandus; in fine, were Clarke and other commentators of a hundred names stripped of the treasures stolen from a Calmet or a Lapide or Maldonat, it would soon be seen what are the merits of Protestants, and what the independent merits of Catholics as scholars, able, learned, profound: scholars fitted for the task of expounding Holy Writ.

How then happens it, it will be asked, that Catholics are looked upon as enemies of the written word; why is it stated and believed that they are afraid of the Bible because conscious of the discrepancy which exists between the teachings of the Church and the teachings of the written revelation, if facts be such as have been hitherto alleged? This query can only be answered in one way; and in a manner by no means flattering to the judgment or veracity of our opponents. But the truth is this: these false assertions are the offspring of hatred, and originate in an unwillingness to judge favourably of a party which is hated because dreaded, and dreaded because injured. As every kind of base accusation was urged against the new law by the enemies of Christianity, and was when once uttered

credited and widely circulated,[1] and made the basis of a superstructure of accumulated wicked allegations, so is it now: a falsehood is uttered by one, it is believed by the many, and the many add such additional and varying circumstances that at last the original mis-statement is multiplied a hundred fold: it has increased in malignity, in intensity, in cause, in effect; in every way it has changed. The best of motives, and the holiest of reasons, —reasons which religion and a zeal for faith dictated, are explained away in the most unfavourable manner; what was done for God is made to appear to have been done in opposition to him; and what was suggested by a love of truth and a reverence for things sacred, and a desire to secure the salvation of men, is held up as a conspiracy against revelation, piety, and man's eternal interests. In elucidation of this matter, I will endeavour to lay before the reader a few facts, which will at once more distinctly point out and meet the Protestant difficulty, which has been fostered to such an extent, and dwelt on as something very remarkable.

At the beginning of the sixteenth century, the pastors of Catholicity beheld with regret the dissemination of heretical works—of works dangerous both to faith and morals. To facilitate the detection of this class of productions, and thus to put the Catholic on his guard, several zealous theologians published lists of works which were deemed by them to be particularly dangerous and prejudicial. Charles V of Spain was pleased with the idea, and accordingly he advised the theological faculty of

[1] See on this head my work on "*The Jesuits*," p. 39, &c., or *Reeve's Apologists of Christianity passim.*

Louvain to publish a catalogue of those works either positively heretical or suspected of heresy, and which might be considered most dangerous at that critical period. The work was accordingly undertaken and published, with the Emperor's authority, in 1546. Another edition eventually appeared under the same sanction in 1556.[2] Encouraged by the imperial example, the Pontiff Paul IV, ordered the heads of the Holy Inquisition, in 1557, to prepare for the press a similar work. Accordingly they did so: and the result of their toils appeared two years later, with the express approbation of his Holiness. This work is divided into three parts: the first part containing a list of those authors whose publications were altogether forbidden; the second a list of those particular works of any author which alone were prohibited; and the third consisting of some anonymous writings, and a clause forbidding all such works written since 1519. This clause was followed by the names of sixty printers, whose works, irrespective of author, subject, &c., were absolutely inhibited. As Spondanus observes, this Pope was the first to issue such a sweeping condemnation.[3]

Nor did the zeal of the pastors to secure their people against the errors and demoralization of the sixteenth century stop here. In the fourth session of the Council of Trent, held February 26, 1562, it was proposed that some persons should be selected to examine the works of

[2] Edicta Flandriæ, l. i, rub. 7.

[3] Ad ann. 1557. "Primus extitit qui *universalem* omnium perniciosorum librorum cujuscumque argumenti etiam profani, a quibuscumque etiamque religione Catholicis Scriptorum, vel etiam a suspectis Typographis de quacumque arte editorum Indicem contexere studuerit; cum ad eum usque diem, librorum prohibitiones tam a Pontificibus quam ab Imperatoribus factæ, nunquam excessissent terminos librorum hæreticorum. . . ."

heretics, and report to the Council their ideas relative to the best course to be adopted for obviating the evils resultant from such productions. After some discussion the task was committed to Drascovitius, the imperial orator for the kingdom of Hungary, to Trivinsanus, patriarch of Venice, and to a committee of four archbishops, nine bishops, two generals of religious orders, and one abbot; but with this clause, "That the index should not be published before the termination of the Council."[1] The task was entered on with energy; but on account of its extent and the desire which was universally felt of bringing the Council to a close as early as possible, it was not concluded time enough to receive the approbation of the assembled fathers. Before, however, parting, the fathers decreed that "whatsoever had been done should be laid before the most holy Roman Pontiff; and that it should by his judgment and authority be terminated and made public."[2] In conformity with this decree, passed at the very last sitting of the Council, the *Index* was drawn up and presented to Pius, as he testifies in his brief *Dominici gregis.* But the authors went beyond the instructions they had received. Observing in the former Index of Paul "several things which required explanation," they composed, after having maturely and quietly weighed the matter, and asked the advice of the most learned theologians of every nation, *the ten rules* of the Index, as Forerius[3] observes, who was the secretary to the congre-

[1] Spondanus ad ann. 1562, § 17.

[2] "Præcipit ut quidquid ab illis præstitum est, sanctissimo Romano Pontifici exhibeatur; et ejus judicio atque auctoritate terminetur et evulgetur."—Sess. xxv, c. 21, Concil. Trident.

[3] See Forerius' Preface.

gation engaged on the Index. These rules were published with the Index, which appeared on the 24th March, 1564, three months after the Council had been brought to a close.

From what has been said it follows, 1° that the very notion of an Index originated in the unfortunate circumstances of those days. Lutherans and others were endeavouring to corrupt the public mind; and Catholics strove to shut out heresy in itself and in *its works*. 2° The Index can only be entitled the Index of *the Council of Trent* in a wide sense. 3° The *ten rules of the Index cannot in any way be called the rules of the Council of Trent.* This observation has escaped the notice of almost all writers opposed to the Index; still it is not new, for St. Charles Borromeo drew a broad line of demarcation between the origin of the Index and the rules of the Index—and than his no higher authority can be obtained or indeed desired. In the fifth synod which he held at Milan he says that the Index was published *by order of the Council of Trent;* but of the rules he observes in the first synod, that they emanated from those to whom the task of drawing up the Index had been entrusted.[4] When once the Index was published, it became the duty of the Inquisition to guard it and its rules. But this body was

[4] "Ab iis qui illi negotio a Sacrosancto Con. Trid. præfecti fuerunt."—Van Espen, vol. i, p. 209, and seqq.——I know, indeed, that even writers of eminence, as Possevinus in appar. verbo Index; Sixtus Senens, l. vi, annot. 152; the faculty of Paris in 1567; the Council of Toulouse in 1590, &c., call the rules the rules of the Council of Trent; and this opinion is warmly defended by Harney in his work, "De Sacrâ Scripturâ linguis vulgaribus legendâ;" but it is clear that the expression is inaccurate, and directly opposed to the positive statements of even he framers of those laws.

already too much engaged; hence the saintly successor of Pius IV—Pius V[1]—instituted the Congregation of the Index, which consists of a numerous body of cardinals, bishops, prelates, and other learned men, to which he assigned the guardianship of the faith and morals of Catholics against the covert or open attacks of heresy and infidelity, through the medium of the press.

The rules of this Congregation have naturally enough been severely handled by heretics of every grade. Formed with the express object of guarding the faithful against error, and the subtle poison communicated through writings of varying character, and of stopping the circulation and the purchase of those books, it might naturally be expected that they would be attacked in every way, regard neither being paid to judgment, justice, or truth.

But the *fourth* rule, regarding the sacred Scriptures in the vernacular, is the one which has afforded the enemies of Rome the most specious pretext, for insulting and denouncing Catholicity. It has been to heretics what the Sabbath was to the Jews. As in consequence of Christ's mode of observing it, his enemies took occasion to calumniate and vilify, and justify their hatred and persecution of, the Messias, and further to set at nought all the miracles and other evidences which were day by day laid before them of the advent of *the Emmanuel;* so on account of the method pursued in regard to the Scriptures by the framers of the rules of the Index, Protestants have shut their eyes to the light, have denounced Christ's Church,

[1] Van Espen says Sixtus V, but this is a mistake. See Devoti, vol. iv, p. 103, and Scotti's Problemi di Politica, &c., vol. ii, on the language of the ritual.

[2] See *Cracas* for 1853.

and assigned, as erst, all miraculous evidences and other heavenly interpositions to fraud and jugglery and satanic influences. Christ and Christ's spouse have ever been treated similarly. This is the rule referred to. "Since it is manifest *from experience*, that if there be no restriction with respect to reading the holy Scriptures in the vulgar tongue, *more harm than good* will come from it, *on account of man's presumptuous rashness:* therefore it shall depend on the discretion of the Bishop or the Inquisitor, on the recommendation of the Parish Priest or the Confessor, to give permission to read, in their own language, any version of the holy Scriptures, which has been made by Catholic authors, to those whom they shall know to be in a state to receive no detriment from the perusal, but an increase of faith and piety: it is required that the permission be given in writing." To this rule our adversaries point in scornful derision; and from it they deduce their charges of hatred and aversion, on the part of Catholics, to the sacred Scriptures. To me it appears clear, that this *Io triumphe*, this *pœan* of victory, is as ill-timed as it is ill-judged.

For 1° What are the positions maintained in this rule? These: 1° that *experience had proved that more harm than good had resulted* from an unrestricted reading of the Scriptures in the vernacular. 2° That the cause of this was not indeed the sacred text, but *the rashness and presumption of the reader;* and 3° that those therefore should alone be allowed to read this class of translations who would be benefited and not injured by the persusal. Now can any one deny that these propositions are full of truth and full of wisdom, when examined either abstractedly, or according to those principles in which every Catholic does

and must believe, if he be a sincere member of his Church? I might lay great stress on this latter circumstance, for it is monstrous to allow the Protestant to *assume* the truth of his solibiblical system, whilst examining the conduct which Catholic prelates should pursue in reference to the flocks committed to their care. Catholics legislate on Catholic principles, and not on those maintained by Protestants; they legislate for believers, for those in, not for those out of, the Church. Did we look upon faith as something unsettled, or as something which had yet to be discovered, or as something which God had left to the decision of every individual; did we further believe that God had appointed a book to be the shibboleth of orthodoxy, the bewildering moral *maelstrom* into which every one was to plunge ere he could procure the pearl of faith, then might the Protestant cry out victory, as he heard the sentence inhibiting free access to the holy but awful thing. But such are not our thoughts, such is not our belief. Our adversaries must either refute our principles, which hitherto has not been done, or show that the causes of restraint are not valid, and this again is a task above their puny strength, ere they affect to triumph over us. Let us examine the three reasons adduced by the framers of the fourth rule just cited.

1° *Is it not a fact,* that experience had shewn that more evil than good had resulted from the promiscuous and unrestricted reading of the Scriptures in the vulgar tongue? Let us examine facts. At that very time what was before the world, as well as before the Fathers of Trent? Why, the most horrible of sights to a Christian. Christianity was then being torn to pieces. Lutherans and Calvinists, Anabaptists, Carlostadians, and Zuing-

lians, had already divided and subdivided even the systems which had just been established in Germany and Switzerland; and in England similar effects were likewise manifest. The new religionists, all pleaded *the Gospel* in excuse for their blasphemies, and by the written word justified their divisions and separations from unity. Already the reader has seen a proof of this in the enactments of Henry, which practically forbad the tradesman and the poor to use the Bible at all; his attention will now be directed to the statement of the great German reformer, Luther. "The devil has got among you: he daily sends new visitors to knock at my door. One will not hear of *baptism;* another rejects the Sacrament of *the Eucharist;* a third teaches that a new world will be created by God before the day of judgment; another that *Christ is not God:* in short, one this and another that. There are almost as many creeds as individuals.... No later than yesterday one came to me: 'Sir, I am sent by God who created heaven and earth;' and then he began to preach like a real idiot, that it was the order of God that I should read the books of Moses for him. 'Ah! where did you find this commandment of God?' 'In the Gospel of St. John.' After he had spoken much, I said to him: 'Friend, come back to-morrow, for I cannot read for you at one sitting the books of Moses.... Whilst the papacy lasted there were no such divisions or dissensions."[1] As early

[1] *Ein Briefe D. M. Luther an die Christen zu Autorf.* Wittemburg, 1525, 4to., and D. M. Luther Briefe, t. iii, p. 60. For an account of the Black Boar controversy between *Luther and Carlostadt*, the reader may see Audin, p. 322, and for that with the cobbler at Orlamunde, see ibid, p. 320, and Luther's works, Jenæ, tom. 1, fol. 467. Both parties of course proved their doctrines from Scripture.

as 1527, there were eight different interpretations of the words, "This is my body," and thirty years later, there were no fewer than eighty-five,[1] and Bellarmine tells us, in a work which was published in 1577, that the number of varying expositions had increased to two hundred. (Bell. de Euch. c. viii.) The land where there had been formerly but one faith, became a Babel of confusion; and men were what the Apostles had foretold, no better than "children, tossed to and fro by every wind of doctrine." Nor has the face of things improved either in Germany, in Switzerland, in England, or indeed elsewhere where the new system was set up. Based on the Bible,—such is the assertion,—rationalism and heresy have multiplied to such an extent, that it would fill a volume even to describe briefly all the recent heresies. Some future Epiphanius or Augustine, will fill volumes larger in size on heresies and the "wanderings of the human intellect," than were composed in the fourth and fifth centuries, by the fathers just named.

Nor did morals fare better than faith: "Hodie Lutheranice vivemus" became a term expressive of debauch and drunkenness. As Erasmus well observes, the thoughts of the early reformers were only intent on the gratification of passion; and that his account is not overwrought is clear even from Luther's own statement. "I should not," he says, "be astonished if God opened at length the gates and windows of hell, and snowed or hailed down devils, or rained on our heads fire and brimstone, or buried us in a fiery abyss, as he did Sodom and Gomorrah. Had Sodom and Gomorrah received the gifts which have been

[1] Audin, p. 308.

granted to us—had they seen our visions and heard our instructions—they would yet be standing.... Since the downfall of popery, and the cessation of its excommunications and spiritual penalties, the people have learned to despise the word of God. They care no longer for the Churches; they have ceased to fear and honor God."[2] Bucer enters more into details. "The greater part of the people," he observes, "seem to have embraced the Gospel, only in order to shake off the yoke of discipline, and the obligation of fasting, penances, &c., which lay upon them in the time of popery, and to live at their pleasure, enjoying their lustful and lawless appetite without controul. They, therefore, lend a willing ear to the doctrine that we are justified by faith alone and not by good works, having no relish for them."[3] Already we have stated in the language of Henry and Latimer, what was the moral degradation of England, consequent on the reformation: from these and similar statements the attentive reader will easily learn the genius of Protestantism.

Again, shortly after the reformation, a general insurrection of the peasants broke out, which eventuated in a renewal of all the excesses in which the Hussites had formerly indulged. It was quelled indeed with vigour, but not before much blood had flowed, and carnage had stalked over the country. But ten years later, another insurrection burst forth. John of Leyden at the head of his adherents would establish the empire of God by fire

[2] Luther's Wercke, Altenberg, t. iii, p. 519.

[3] Bucer, de regno Christi. On this scandalous subject, see Trevern's Amicable Discussion, vol. i, p. 84; *Nicholas* "Du Protestantisme," p. 543; and an excellent article teeming with facts in the Dublin Review, March 1846.

and sword. Amid excesses of the most disgusting character, and words of horrid blasphemy, he made his triumphant entrance into Munster. Of course excess was followed by excess; and if the fanaticism of the tailor king was crushed, this was not effected without much bloodshedding. But who was this Attila of the war against the poor? Luther. As Menzel[1] well notes, his violence against the emperor and the German princes at the close of the Diet of Nuremberg in 1522, was the seed of future seditions and wars. Egged on by Luther's words, the peasants unfurled the standard of *liberty;* and as they heard him[2] again accusing in language of unmeasured violence princes and lords, bishops, priests, and monks, of oppression and plunder, and saw him point to the peasants swords, as God's instruments to chastise those enemies of the peasant and of society at large, their enthusiasm knew no bounds. They fearlessly made their demands, the justice of which they established by reference to holy Writ; hoping and believing that he who had encouraged them to rise would not abandon them in the hour of need. But great was their disappointment. The Apostle of the Reformation[3] became the greatest enemy of the peasants; against them he wrote; their emancipation he opposed, and their slavery he defended. The Heresiarch heard of the butchery of 100,000 men, of the destruction of numerous cities and monasteries, and churches, but he had no tear to shed. "It is I who have done it by order of God," he brutally exclaimed, "and whoever has perished in this combat, has lost both body

[1] See Audin, p. 285 and seq. [2] Ibid, p. 309, 310.
[3] Tom. iii, fol. 139. Ed. Jenæ; and Audin, 318.

and soul, and is eternally damned!" "Poor peasants," says Osiander, "whom Luther flattered and caressed while they were content with attacking the Bishops and the Clergy! But when the revolt assumed another aspect, and the insurgents mocked at his bull, and threatened him and his princes,—then appeared another bull, in which he preached up the slaughter of the peasants as if they were so many sheep. And when they were killed, how, think you, did he celebrate their funeral? By marrying a nun!"[4] Yes, as Erasmus feelingly remarks, whilst Luther was revelling at his nuptials, "a hundred thousand peasants were descending into the tomb." *Morituri te salutant* was the cry which followed Luther to the bridal chamber. The oppressors of the *slave* had often before listened to the salutation!

Such were the results of the indiscriminate use of the Bible: discord in religion, discord in civil government, and an overthrow of morality. What beneficial fruits did the perusal of the Bible produce to outbalance this mighty mass of miseries? It produced none deserving of serious notice.

2° The second proposition will be readily admitted by every Protestant. For though disorders may arise from the indiscriminate perusal of the Bible in the vernacular, it does not follow that the Bible itself is to be blamed. He only will be deserving of censure who applies it to a purpose for which it was never intended by the Almighty; and who, devoid of proper information, and of knowledge

[4] See Spalding for this and numerous other passages drawn from German writers, relative to their opinions as to the originator of this horrid catastrophe, p. 272 and seq., of his excellent review of D'Aubigny. I refer to the Irish edition.

sufficient to justify the assumed character of prophet to and interpreter of the Bible, sets himself up as the judge of orthodoxy, and as a commentator abundantly qualified to decide on *the* meaning of the inspired text.

3° Nor can more doubt exist, relative to the third proposition, to wit, that those only should be permitted to read the word who might be expected to derive rather benefit than injury from it. This proposition is self-evident; and acting on this principle, every parent would rightly extend, limit, or wholly interdict the use of the most innocent and abstractedly useful things, to his children. If experience prove, that certain studies, though good in themselves, are to some individuals sources of ruin; that companions however desirable in themselves are in point of fact injurious; that certain foods, though good, are to this individual a stimulus to excess, or at this season dangerous; that allowances suited to another's taste are made the prolific parent of crime and extravagance, assuredly it becomes a duty to remove these causes of misery, so long as they may be prudently adjudged to be detrimental. The disorganised system must be treated very differently from the well ordered; and of this no one either does or affects to doubt in matters regarding only life and this present state of existence. Why should not the principle be extended? Why should it not be made to embrace the future as well as the present, and eternal as well as temporal interests?

In fact, learned and zealous Protestants have written more absolutely in reference to the necessity of some kind of restriction, than even the compilers of the fourth rule. Take as one instance out of many which might readily be adduced, the following words of the illustrious Bishop

Jebb. After assigning that meaning to the words ερευνᾶτε τὰς γραφᾶς, which we have already vindicated, he continues: "The meaning thus established will, I hope, not be found deficient in practical results of the most important and most edifying character. From the case of the Jews, we may learn how possible it is, not only to read the Scriptures but to read them with attention, with diligence, and even with some degree of lively interest, and at the same time to reap no other fruit from this study than heightened responsibility and aggravated condemnation. And at the present day this lesson would seem to be particularly seasonable. For on the one hand, from a zeal very sincere, but not very considerate, the Scriptures are circulated in such a manner as, unintentionally, I am sure, but still effectually, to countenance the notion, that the mere perusal, I had almost said the bare possession of the sacred volume, may be available for the attainment of eternal life; whilst on the other hand we find melancholy proof, that the Bibles indiscriminately scattered through the land, may be rendered instrumental to the most wicked and infernal purposes. The volume of Scriptures is now in every hand. And men without faith, without hope, without charity, without God in the world, are labouring to convert that volume into the text-book of anarchy and atheism. The book, the chapter, and the verse, are unblushingly referred to, whence a disastrous and diabolical chemistry extracts the poison of blasphemy and unbelief. The shops, the markets, the stalls, the very courts of justice, are saturated with those materials of destruction temporal and eternal. And at such a time, and amidst such a deluge of unnatural impiety, the people ought to be set upon their guard. They ought to be instructed

how possible it is to read the Scriptures, not only without edification, but with moral and spiritual detriment. They ought to be made sensible that the word of God, if it prove not a saviour of life unto life, may become a saviour of death unto death. They ought to be warned in the same spirit, and almost in the same words, with which our Blessed Saviour warned the Jews of old: *take heed how ye hear* was his solemn admonition; and from every pulpit of this nation, and by every minister of God's holy word, I could wish to hear pronounced the seasonable, salutary warning,—*beware how ye read!*"[1] And in a note attached to a sermon preached in 1803, for an association which, among other things, proposed to supply every house in the kingdom with a Bible where there was not one, he makes the following observation: "This declaration requires to be qualified. As *a final attainment* the object should never be relinquished. But, in the first instance, the probability, at least, should be ascertained, that, *wherever the Scriptures are given, they will be reverently received, and piously employed,* Otherwise, we may be found acting in opposition to that injunction of our Blessed Lord, St. Matthew vii, 6."[2]

Such precisely were the views of the heads of the Congregation of the Index—views adopted, too, by the Roman Pontiff. The precious thing was not to be given to *dogs*, nor was the costly pearl to be tossed *before swine.* Holy things were to be treated holily; and where it was known that they would be desecrated, it was deemed better, and more conformable to the principles of the guardians of the sacred deposit, and more useful even for the perverse, to

[1] Jebb's Practical Theology, vol. i, p. 303 and seq. [2] Vol. ii, p. 29

withhold rather than to grant what, under other circumstances, would joyfully have been conceded. Had not experience proved the perverseness of certain persons, had it not been evident that practically the book of God had been made the book of Satanic teaching, had it not been feared lest this wickedness might be perpetuated, and still further insults be offered to God, even on account of the inspired Scriptures, then no prohibition would have been issued. The prohibition was against *the wicked and the perverse,*—for the good and the pious there was practically no prohibition: these were exhorted by their pastors to read the sacred word, for to them it would prove a source of consolation and of encouragement; and reading in faith, they would recognize everywhere facts and words confirmatory of the teaching of the Church. The rule pointed out, in a word, those who would be benefited and those who would be injured by the perusal of the holy volume. To the former the Scriptures were to be conceded; but to the latter they were wisely denied. In point of fact, as is evident both from the words of Bishop Jebb and of the fourth rule, it was not *the perusal* but *the interpretation* which was heeded. *The consequences* drawn from the letter—the setting up of self against the Church—the appointing individual reason as the principle of faith instead of a properly constituted authority, arrested the attention of the heads of the Church, and forced them to interfere; for these consequences and these principles were known to be anti-Christian. Thus viewed the whole affair assumes again a different aspect; for it has been already shown, and this is practically universally admitted, that all men are not

capable of drawing up a rule of faith, a system of religion from the Scripture; and consequently that those who affected to do this—and this was the point guarded against—were unfit, in any sense, to read with profit the Bible. And how pointedly the rule was directed against the ignorant, against those who in fact could neither judge of the integrity of the text, nor of the meaning of the text, is obvious from this: only vernacular translations were prohibited. Bibles in the original tongue, or in Latin, were not at all proscribed. In other words, those who could *really study the text,* those who were *scholars,* and were best able as individuals to judge of its meaning, were not in any ways impeded from studying, reading, when and as much as they chose, the sacred word: and in the face of this fact shall some be still ignorant enough to repeat the foolish strain: Therefore does the Church of Rome inhibit the perusal of the Bible, because she knows that she is opposed to the Bible. She allows it freely to the *wise and learned, without fearing any such detection or discrepancy;* and are the unwise they who are to make the important discovery? Those possessed of a thorough knowledge of the language of the Jew, and Greek, and Roman; those whose time is their own; those who have all the appliances resultant from ease and wealth to prosecute their studies successfully; those who have the power of publishing to the world the results of their individual discoveries, are unrestrained as far as any law of the Church goes; and nothing is done to withdraw the Bible from their hands. These are not dreaded; and does the Church dread the discoveries of the drunken and the debauched, and of those whose intellectuality and appli-

ances are on a par with their knowledge? Surely, the malicious insinuation, or rather assertion, is as the poet says—

> "———— An argument
> Of human weakness, rather than of strength."

Would the Protestant know why the framers of the Index drew up the rule they did? It was to save the less favoured children of the Church from seduction; it was to guard them against the wickedness of heresy and the foolish inferences of ignorance; it was to secure them against ruin in the hour of darkness and of tempest and of deluge; it was to snatch them from pastures which had been laid bare, and from wells which had been poisoned, and to give them saving and strengthening food, uncorrupted and uncontaminated. The Church was a mother: and as a mother she was obliged specially to guard, and specially to attend to the interests of her weaker children. These thoughts guided the legislators who framed, and the prelates who commanded the observance of, the rules of the Index. The Church was bound to make her teachings known, bound to teach all truth to the end of time; but she was not bound to command all persons to read—much less was she bound to tell each person to read and judge for himself. Nay more, hers was the duty to inhibit this private system of religion, since her authority was paramount and absolute. And when it is remembered with what rigour the Jews restrained their youth from reading at all certain portions of the Scriptures, as *the Canticle of Canticles, the Book of Genesis,* &c., though there were few dangers then to faith and morals compared with those which inundated the land, as we have already

seen, in the sixteenth century; when further it is known how, as Lord Clarendon observes, regicides justified their crimes formerly by appeals to the sacred texts, that polygamy and neglect of families, and other still worse crimes, not to speak of a thousand heresies, have in our own days been vindicated as lawful on the warrantee of Holy Writ, will not every one admit, that such a precaution as was taken formerly might now well be adopted everywhere and by everybody, howsoever opposed they may be to Rome and her religion? Where there is heresy, the *letter of the law* is lifeless—there is no vivifying principle in it: it is the *outward covering of the body of death, and not the instrument of the Spirit.*

The rules, however formed, were obviously of a disciplinary character. They were similar to those which had been formerly made with the object of stopping the desolation caused by the Albigenses, but which had, after the momentary emergency, either fallen into desuetude or been formally rescinded. The errors and corruptions and *principles* of the sixteenth century caused the renewal of the restriction. But the real nature of heresy did not long remain a secret. From its fruits, its disuniting, unspiritual and worldly character was soon manifest; and after the first revolutionary outburst, little need was there of alarm. Within fifty years Protestantism attained its greatest height in Germany and elsewhere,[1] and after that it became year by year more divided and more impotent. Kingdoms seemingly powerless to escape the pressure of heresy, as France, Belgium, Bavaria, Bohemia, Poland, Hungary, and Austria, passed through the ordeal successfully—Protestantism was vanquished and humbled, and

[1] See Macauley, Rankes' Popes, p. 16.

the tide of heterodoxy was rolled back with resistless fury on the oppressors of the Church. Catholicity everywhere gained important victories, whilst Protestantism has been unable to reconquer what was lost by her more than two hundred years ago. Countries may have since become infidel, but none have become Protestant. Protestantism is too well known to gain over—notwithstanding the recourse had to bribery and political influences—any kingdom. Hence the original rules have been considerably modified; and as the learned Father Perrone observes, there is hardly a people now which has not the Bible in the vernacular, and which does not make use of it with either the tacit or express permission of the Roman Pontiffs and Bishops; all that these require being a faithful version and suitable notes.[2] The modification referred to dates from the thirteenth of June, 1757. In that year Benedict XIV approved of the following decree of the Congregation of the Index: "If versions of the Bibles of this class in the vulgar tongue shall have been approved of by the Apostolic See, or published with notes drawn from the holy fathers of the Church, or from learned and Catholic men, they are permitted."[3] Hence it happened that Pius VI so warmly approved of the translation of Martini: his words are the following: "At a time when a vast number of bad books, which most grossly attack the Catholic religion, are circulated even among the unlearned, &c., you judge exceedingly well that the faithful should be excited to the reading of the Holy Scriptures; for they are most plentiful fountains which ought to be open to every one, whence to draw sanctity of morals and

[2] Prælectiones Theolog. t. ix, p. 227.

[3] On this matter see Scotti's "*Problemi di Politica, &c.*, vol. ii, 269, 275.

doctrine, to eradicate the errors which are widely disseminated in these corrupt times. This you have seasonably accomplished, as you declare, by publishing the sacred writings in the language of your country, suitable to every one's capacity; especially when you show and set forth that you have added explanatory notes, which, being extracted from the Holy Fathers, preclude every possible danger of abuse. Thus you have not swerved either from the laws of the Congregation of the Index, or from the Constitution published on this subject by Benedict XIV." Hence if the Bible be Catholic, and contain explanatory notes, everything has been done which the Church prescribes; and every person is, as far as the Church is concerned, at liberty to read modern and vernacular translations.

But even prior to this modification the fourth rule of the Index was never enforced either in this or in many other countries. The rule had not been promulgated by numerous prelates. To them it appeared better, all circumstances considered, not to issue the forbiddance; and hence it has happened that the perusal of Catholic translations has always been in this, as well as in various other parts of Europe, absolutely unrestricted. According to the Protestant theory, then, England should be the land of pure Protestantism, as well as of Bible reading; and here, at least, there should be no converts, no Catholics. But what is the fact? Do facts and theory agree? No. Hundreds of learned ministers have joined the faith, as well as thousands of lay persons, in high and low life:—they have left Protestantism, because it is a religion without a creed, and a merely human system, which is devoid of all marks of divinity, and opposed in numberless ways

even to the written word of God. Day by day Catholicism increases, and Protestantism decreases. It cannot be said in return, that some Catholics have abandoned their Church for Protestantism because they had discovered in the Bible the errors of Popery. This cry has been raised, indeed; it has gone forth over England; Bible agents and Bible distributors and tract circulators have given importance to the assertion, but it is well known to be false. These apostates had either lost their virtue before they had lost their religion, or at all events, they had only adopted their new opinions in consequence of some circumstances extrinsic to the Bible. This, I say, is a fact co-extensive with the work of seduction. And what *opinions* did such men embrace; were they such as Anglicanism can approve of? Were they indeed the teachings of the Bible?

But, it will be said, is it not well known that "Rome is opposed to the Bible? Have not the leading Pontiffs of this century, Pius VII, Leo XII, Gregory XVI, as well as Pius IX, denounced in the strongest terms that Society which is wholly devoted to the circulation of the written word—the Bible Society;[1] and does not this denunciation involve a hatred of the Bible? Do people denounce that which they love, and is war made against that power which is looked upon as friendly and serviceable in the struggle for religion?" The reply is easy; it is deducible, indeed, from what has been said. 1° The Protestant Bible, in the opinion of the Roman Pontiffs, and indeed of the Catholic Church, is not a true copy of the Bible:

1 See the briefs of Pius VII, dated June 29th, and September 3rd, 1816; of Leo XII, May 3rd, 1824; of Gregory XVI, in l'Ami de la Religion, October 24, 1840.

for many a text is there corrupted, and many a sacred book is either altogether omitted[1] or is denominated apocryphal. This being the case, who can consistently affect to feel surprise at the denunciations of the head pastors of the Church? Should an occasional chapter, or indeed a verse here and there, be deliberately and of set purpose dropped from some future editions of the Bible by either Socinian, Dissenter, or Catholic, what would the Anglican, who received that chapter and those verses, say?—Assuredly, the words of *Revelations*, "If any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city," would be printed in staring capitals against the corrupter of the text. Have not we heard of stormy controversies occasioned by the alteration, real or supposed, of *a single letter* of the Holy Scriptures?[2] And is the Travis and Porson controversy relative to John i, v. 7, even now forgotten, or so much as settled? Now the Pontiff is the guardian, as head of the Church, of the Scriptures; in their preservation he is and must be deeply interested; not to be watchful would be in him a crime. This he knows; and hence, recently as well as formerly, he has raised his voice to warn the faithful against the corrupters, the suppressors, and the denouncers of those Scriptures, which are one, and one only; and of that oneness, the Catholic Bible is the only fair representation. It

[1] The Bibles of the Society are not the *authorized* version. This circumstance is not sufficiently attended to by *orthodox* Protestants, who rest their faith on the Bible of James I.

[2] The reader knows what a controversy raged about the reading of one manuscript, whether the letter was θ or O. Even microscopes were necessary to draw *God* out of the word.

is, then, to misrepresent, to conceal the real state of the question, to hold up Rome as opposed to the Bible, because opposed to a book so called, circulated by the Bible Society. That book is not *the* Bible; at the best, it is a corrupt and imperfect copy:—and to call it *the* Bible is, in the belief of the Catholic, a denial of a sacred article of faith, solemnly framed in the fourth session of the Council of Trent, and approved of by Christendom.

2° The Pontiffs are opposed to the Bible Society, on account of the principle advocated by the fautors of this system. The principle is this: a book is to be the rule of faith; the means through which mankind is to be made acquainted with the dogmas and the practices of religion. This principle has been already shown to be false, and directly opposed, indeed, to that advocated by Jesus Christ, and maintained by Apostles and Apostolic men. It is a principle, in fact, utterly inapplicable for 1450 years—and dependant, as we have demonstrated, for its possibility on the invention of the art of printing. Christ appointed a body of ministers, and not a book, to teach all truth to the end of time.

3° They are opposed to it, on account of its constitution, which betrays an utter ignorance of the first constituent of Christ's religion, namely *unity*. For who form this Society?—who are the men who support it, meet together in its favour, laud its workings in speeches, in writings, and in conversations, and sedulously labour to carry out its objects? They are men of a multiplicity of creeds! Anglicans, Baptists, Methodists, Socinians, and such like heretics!! From this "*discors concordia*," this amalgamation of heterogeneous elements, and this open avowal that the Bible is in the hands of Anglicans Anglican, of

Baptists Baptist, of Methodists Methodist, is it not clear that those who believe that such a combination is wickedly latitudinarian, and only calculated to tear faith into innumerable pieces, and make Jews and Gentiles laugh at the divinity of Christianity, which is thus practically maintained to be either in opposition with itself, or so strangely obscure in its only rule, as to render the supposition of unity utterly absurd and ridiculous, are bound to denounce the propagandists of latitudinarianism and the supporters of this hydra-heresy. What must be the feelings of the religious mind, as it witnesses the shipping off of tens of thousands of volumes, year after year, for the spread not of the Gospel of Christ, for that is one, but of the doctrines of every kind of fanatic, who may ascribe to the Almighty his own folly or blasphemies. Surely a feeling of horror must come over it; and every one who has the right to interfere will do so, in order to stem the stream of vice and error. The Pontiff, then, does well in raising his voice and warning the nations against the delusion. Instead of censure, the Holy Father is deserving of the thanks of mankind. Again, what must thoughtful Jews and Gentiles conclude from the fact of so many varying religionists circulating the same word as the word of God, and yet professing creeds so diametrically opposed? Why, with reason might they say, "Is your God, then, a God of contradictions? If he be, we want him not; but if he be one and truthful, then why do not you, who come hither to enlighten us, agree among yourselves about Him and his doctrines? You tell us that the Bible is the rule of faith, and that it is easily understood; prove your words to be true: agree about the meaning of your easy book; let us see Christians one, and then we may begin to read and

study your authorities. Till that is done, we will cling to the Synagogue, and we will continue to worship at the altars of our fathers, and laugh at those who affect to pity us." Is not the end of the writing of the Bible to make men *one;* and does not the Bible Society make men *many?* As long as Methodists, and Baptists, and Independents, and Anglicans equally diffuse the book, is not the world deluged by a multiplicity of faiths? The defenders of one creed are allied to the advocates of a contradictory system, by an unhallowed compromise; and though the same word may be used, and the same Bible circulated, the discordance of sentiment and of object is palpably admitted.

4° The device adopted, and the mal-appropriation of the words Bible, Holy Scripture, *Word of God*, would of themselves justify all the opposition which has been raised by Rome against this kind of Society. It was seen by the framers of the Bible Association that, as the Society was to be composed of individuals of every persuasion, it would be very important not to allow any observations to be made regarding the *meaning* of the Bible. Hence no note, no comment, no interpretation of any kind—no, not even such as appeared in the authorized version, was permitted. The divine law was nominally to be left entirely unexplained; and the necessity of a ministry was to be merged in the circulation of a Bible. At the meetings of the Society all speak of the *Bible*, all agree that it is a divine book, and all praise its merits to the skies; if on earth there be peace and harmony, surely they are to be found in these meetings. "Tros Tyriusve"—it matters not what may be the religion of one's neighbour: he is a friend of the Bible; that is enough. But, in point of fact,

is there any real union? Is not this peace the veriest delusion; and are not the words used, the speeches spouted, reported, published, and widely circulated, intended to deceive the unthinking masses. There is no union of sentiment whatever; and the various pastors, whilst speaking of the Bible, mean something very dissentient and discordant. They mean not a stringing together of mere words and letters, but they mean words with a specific meaning: for sounds, words only, are not *God's sayings, God's declarations;* they mean those interpretations which respectively they attach to the *letter*. And is there here unity? Is there unity of meaning, of interpretation, of belief? No: their speeches, then, were and are a hoax on the public; and their boasts are an insult to the understanding of their audiences. Fancy to yourselves a platform on which Anglicans and Socinians, Methodists and Independents, Baptists and Hallites, and Quakers appear in mighty array. All make the Bible the theme of their praises, all proclaim it to be God's word, all describe the advantages resultant from its circulation, all speak of it as the very truth, all hold it up as the work which all men should help to circulate everywhere, because it is the only principle of true religion, the only infallible authority to which man can appeal. Notwithstanding appearances, can such a meeting have any other effect than to sicken the true believer? Dissentients in faith, of all classes, met together to use language which *either has no meaning* or *is a known falsehood!* See these men sallying forth from the meeting. One goes to the pulpit of the Church of England, another to a Baptist Chapel, a third to a Methodist Meeting, a fourth to an Independent Congregation. Each opens his Bible, and from it proves his

system of belief! The Anglican maintains the divine origin of the hierarchy; the Baptist laughs it to scorn; the Independent approves the doctrine of the Trinity, and the Socinian looks upon it, not as a mystery of faith, but as an unfathomable depth of folly; the Methodist sings the praises of Wesley, and the Hallite prefers to speak with unheard of familiarity of and to the Deity, on the authority of a sea captain, who looks upon honours as anti-Scriptural, and upon all previous forms of religion as so many deflections from truth. What a change has come over the orators of peace and the panegyrists of Biblical truth! The change reminds us of the poet's description of the Sybil:

> ——— Subito *non vultus*, non *color unus*
> *Non comptæ mansêre comæ; sed pectus anhelum*
> *Et rabie fera corda tument;* majorque videri
> Nec mortale sonans, adflata est numine quando
> Jam propiore Dei.

Who shall wonder if the Pontiff directs attention to the delusion and the deceit practised? The Jews clung *at last* to the letter; and they rejected Jesus Christ. The Bible Society men *affect* to cling to the letter; but the Church knows that the pretence ends in the rejection of everything sacred in Christianity. Shall such results be witnessed, without one voice at least being raised in vindication of God's one truth?

5° The Pontiffs know, moreover, what are the practices of the Bible Society. Wherever the Society obtains a footing, the most strenuous endeavours are made to upset Catholicity where it is established, or entirely to prevent its introduction. Violence, falsehoods, misrepresentations, anti-Catholic tracts—yes, even in some instances anti-

Christian works have been circulated, in order to carry out this unholy design.[1] Such are the facts which have reached the Vatican; and in the face of these facts, shall surprise be still felt at the proceedings of the Pontiffs, and shall the briefs which they occasionally have published, in condemnation of this unholy and anti-Christian Society, be called instruments condemnatory of *the* Bible? Surely not. Out of the Church, I repeat it, and this declaration should never be forgotten, there is no Bible—no fair representation of what God has *really said*. It is in vain for Protestants to call theirs *the* Bible. Such is not the belief of the Church of the living God. The language of Protestantism is and must be wholly repudiated by the followers of *Him of Galilee*.

[1] See on this interesting and important subject the Annals for the last thirteen years of the Propagation of the Faith. These letters are a repertory of information against the Bible Society.

APPENDIX.

APPENDIX.

THE SIX ARTICLES OF HENRY THE EIGHTH.

I. In the Sacrament of the Altar, after the Consecration, there remains no substance of bread and wine; but under these forms the natural body and blood of Christ are present.

II. Communion of both kinds is not necessary to salvation, to all persons, by the law of God; but both the body and flesh of Christ are together in each of the kinds.

III. Priests may not marry by the law of God.

IV. Vows of chastity ought to be observed by the laws of God.

V. Private masses ought to be continued; which, as they are agreeable to God's law, so men receive great benefit from them.

VI. Auricular confession is expedient and necessary, and ought to be retained in the Church.

THE FORTY-TWO ARTICLES OF EDWARD THE SIXTH.

I. Of faith in the Holy Trinity.—There is but one living and true God everlasting, without body, parts, or passions; of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness; the maker and preserver of all things, both visible and

invisible. And in the unity of this Godhead there are three persons, one substance, power, and eternity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

II. THE WORD OF GOD MADE VERY MAN.—The Son, which is the word of the Father, took man's nature in the womb of the Blessed Virgin, of her substance: so that the two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, the Godhead and Manhood, were joined together in one person, never to be divided; whereof is one Christ, very God and very Man, who truly suffered, was crucified, dead and buried, to reconcile his Father to us, and to be a sacrifice not only for original guilt, but also for actual sins of men.

III. OF THE GOING DOWN OF CHRIST INTO HELL.—As Christ died for us and was buried, so also it is to be believed that he went down into hell: for his body lay in the grave till his resurrection; but his soul, being separate from his body, remained with the spirits which were detained in prison, that is to say, in hell, and there preached unto them, as witnesseth that place of Peter.

IV. OF THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST.—Christ did truly rise again from death, and took again his body, with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature, wherewith he ascended into heaven, and there sitteth until he return to judge all men at the last day.

V. THE DOCTRINE OF HOLY SCRIPTURE IS SUFFICIENT TO SALVATION.—Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation, so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, although sometimes it may be admitted, by God's faithful people, as pious and conducing unto order and decency, yet is not required of any man, that it should be delivered as an article

of the faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation.

VI. The Old Testament is not to be rejected.—The Old Testament is not to be rejected, as if it were contrary to the New, but to be retained. Forasmuch as in the Old Testament, as in the New, everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator betwixt God and man, being both God and man. Wherefore they are not to be heard, who feign that the old fathers did look only for transitory promises.

VII. The Three Creeds.—The three Creeds, Nice Creed, Athanasius' Creed, and that which is commonly called the Apostles' Creed, ought thoroughly to be received; for they may be proved by most certain warrants of the Holy Scripture.

VIII. Of original Sin.—Original sin standeth not in the following of Adam (as the Pelagians do vainly talk, and at this day is affirmed by the Anabaptists), but it is the fault and corruption of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam, whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined to evil, so that the flesh lusteth always contrary to the spirit; and therefore, in every person born in the world, it deserveth God's wrath and damnation: and this infection of nature doth remain, yea, in them that are regenerated, whereby the lust of the flesh, called in Greek *Φρονημα σαρκος*, which some do expound the wisdom, some sensuality, some the affection, some the desire of the flesh, is not subject to the law of God. And though there is no condemnation for them that believe and are baptized, yet the Apostle doth confess, that concupiscence and lust hath of itself the nature of sin.

IX. Of free will.—We have no power to do good works, pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of God by Christ preventing us, that we may have good will, and working with us, when we have that good will.

X. Of grace.—The grace of Christ, or the Holy Ghost, which is given by him, doth take from man the heart of stone, and giveth him a heart of flesh. And though it rendereth us willing to do those good works which before we were unwilling to do, and unwilling to do those evil works which before we did, yet is no violence offered by it to the will of man; so that no man when he hath sinned, can excuse himself, as if he sinned against his will, or upon constraint; and therefore that he ought not to be accused or condemned upon that account.

XI. Of the Justification of Man.—Justification by faith only in Jesus Christ, in that sense wherein it is set forth in the homily of justification, is the most certain and most wholesome doctrine for a Christian man.

XII. Works before Justification.—Works done before the grace of Christ, and the inspiration of his spirit, are not pleasant to God: forasmuch as they spring not of faith in Jesus Christ, neither do they make men meet to receive grace, or, as the school authors say, deserve grace of congruity: yea rather, for that they are not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done, we doubt not but they have the nature of sin.

XIII. Works of Supererogation.—Voluntary works, besides, over, and above God's commandments, and which they call works of supererogation, cannot be taught without arrogancy and impiety; for by them men do declare

that they do not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that they do more for his sake than of bounden duty is required: whereas Christ saith plainly, When ye have done all that are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants.

XIV. None but Christ without Sin. — Christ, in the truth of our nature, was made like unto us in all things (sin only excepted), from which he was clearly void both in his flesh and in his spirit. He came to be a lamb without spot, who, by sacrifice of himself once made, should take away the sins of the world; and sin, as St. John saith, was not in him. But all we, the rest (though baptized and born again in Christ) yet offend in many things; and if we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.

XV. Of the Sin against the Holy Ghost. — Not every deadly sin, willingly committed after baptism, is sin against the Holy Ghost, and unpardonable. Wherefore the grant of repentance is not to be denied to such as fall into sin after baptism. After we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace given, and fall into sin; and by the grace of God we may arise again and amend our lives. And therefore they are to be condemned which say, they can no more sin as long as they live here, or deny the place of penance to such as truly repent.

XVI. The Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost.— The blasphemy against the Holy Ghost is then committed, when any man, out of malice and hardness of heart, doth fully reproach and persecute in a hostile manner the truth of God's word, manifestly made known unto him, which sort of men, being made obnoxious to the curse, subject themselves to the most grievous of all wickedness; from

whence this kind of sin is called unpardonable, and so affirmed to be by our Lord and Saviour.

XVII. Of Predestination and Election.—Predestination to life is the everlasting purpose of God, whereby, before the foundations of the world were laid, he hath constantly decreed by his counsel, secret unto us, to deliver from curse and damnation those whom he hath chosen out of mankind, to bring them by Christ to everlasting salvation, as vessels made to honour. Wherefore they which be endued with so excellent a benefit of God, be called, according to God's purpose, by his spirit working in due season; they through grace obey the calling, they be justified freely, they are made "sons of adoption," they are made like the image of the only begotten Jesus Christ, they walk religiously in good works, and at length, by God's mercy, they attain to everlasting felicity. As the godly consideration of predestination and election in Christ is full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort to godly persons, and such as feel in themselves the working of the spirit of Christ, mortifying the works of the flesh, and their earthly members, and drawing up their minds to high and heavenly things, as well because it doth greatly establish and confirm their faith of eternal salvation, to be enjoyed through Christ, as because it doth fervently kindle their love towards God: so for curious and carnal persons, lacking the spirit of Christ, to have continually before their eyes the sentence of God's predestination, is a most dangerous downfall, whereby the devil doth thrust them either into desperation, or into the wretchlessness of most unclean living, no less perilous than desperation. Furthermore, though the decree of predestination be unknown to us, yet must we receive God's promises in such

wise as they be generally set forth to us in Holy Scripture; and in our doings that will of God is to be followed, which we have expressly declared unto us in the word of God.

XVIII. Everlasting Salvation to be obtained only in the Name of Christ.—They are also to be accursed that presume to say, that every man shall be saved by the law or sect which he professeth, so that he be diligent to frame his life according to that law, and the light of nature: for Holy Scripture doth set out unto us only the name of Jesus Christ, whereby men must be saved.

XIX. All Men are bound to keep the Precepts of the Moral Law.—Although the law given from God by Moses, as touching ceremonies and rites, do not bind Christian men, or the civil precepts thereof ought of necessity to be received in any commonwealth; yet, notwithstanding, no Christian man whatsoever is exempted from the obedience of the commandments which are called moral. Wherefore they are not to be heard which teach, that the Holy Scriptures were given to none but to the weak, and brag continually of the spirit, by which they do pretend that all whatsoever they preach is suggested to them, though manifestly contrary to the Holy Scripture.

XX. Of the Church.—The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly administered, according to Christ's ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same. As the Church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch have erred, so also the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their

living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith.

XXI. Of the Authority of the Church.—It is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to God's word written, neither may it so expound one place of Scripture that it be repugnant to another; wherefore, although the Church be a witness and a keeper of holy writ; yet, as it ought not to decree anything against the same, so besides the same ought it not to enforce anything to be believed for necessity of salvation.

XXII. Of the Authority of General Councils.—General councils may not be gathered together without the commandment and will of princes, and when they be gathered together, forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the spirit and word of God, they may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining unto God. Wherefore things ordained by them as necessary to salvation, have neither strength nor authority, unless it be declared that they are taken out of Holy Scripture.

XXIII. Of Purgatory.—The doctrine of the schoolmen, concerning purgatory, pardons, worshipping, and adoration, as well of images as of relics, and also invocation of saints, is a fond thing vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather perniciously repugnant to the word of God.

XXIV. No Man to minister in the Church except he be called.—It is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of public preaching or ministering the Sacraments in the congregation, before he be lawfully called and sent to execute the same; and those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and

called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them in the congregation, to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard.

XXV. All things to be done in the Congregation in such a Tongue as it is understood by the People.—It is most fit and most agreeable to the word of God, that nothing be read or rehearsed in the congregation in a tongue not known unto the people, which Paul hath forbidden to be done, unless some be present to interpret.

XXVI. Of the Sacraments.—Our Lord Jesus Christ gathered his people into a society by Sacraments, very few in number, and most easy to be kept, and of most excellent signification; that is to say, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord. The Sacraments are not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about; but that we should duly use them, and in such only as worthily receive the same, they have a wholesome effect or operation; not, as some say, *ex opere operato*, which terms, as they are strange and utterly unknown to the Holy Scriptures, so do they yield a sense which savoureth of little piety, but of much superstition; but they that receive them unworthily receive to themselves damnation. The Sacraments ordained by the word of God, be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather they be certain sure witnesses, and effectual signs of grace and God's good will towards us, by the which he doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in him.

XXVII. The wickedness of the Ministers takes not away the efficacy of Divine Institution.—Although in the visible church the evil be ever mingled

with the good, and sometimes the evil have chief authority in the ministration of the word and sacraments; yet, forasmuch as they do not the same in their own name, but in Christ's, and do minister by his commission and authority, we may use their ministry both in hearing the word of God, and in receiving the sacraments. Neither is the effect of Christ's ordination taken away by their wickedness, nor the grace of God's gifts diminished from such, as by faith do rightly receive the sacraments ministered unto them, which be effectual, because of Christ's institution and promise, although they be ministered by evil men. Nevertheless it appertaineth to the discipline of the church, that enquiry be made of evil ministers; and that they be accused by those that have knowledge of their offences; and finally, being found guilty, by just judgment, be deposed.

XXVIII. Of Baptism.—Baptism is not only a sign of profession and mark of difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from others that be not christened; but it is also a sign of regeneration, or new birth, whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive baptism rightly, are grafted into the church; the promises of the forgiveness of sin, of our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed; faith is confirmed, and grace increased by virtue of prayer to God. The custom of the church, for baptizing young children, is both to be commended, and by all means to be retained in the church.

XXIX. Of the Lord's Supper.—The supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have amongst themselves one to another; but rather it is a sacrament of our redemption by Christ's death; insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith

receive the same, the bread which we break is a partaking of the body of Christ, and likewise the cup of blessing is a partaking of the blood of Christ. Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of bread and wine), in the supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by holy writ; but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, and hath given occasion to many superstitions. Since the very being of human nature doth require, that the body of one and the same man cannot be at one and the same time in many places, but of necessity must be in some certain and determined place: therefore the body of Christ cannot be present in many different places at the same time; and since (as the Holy Scriptures testify) Christ hath been taken up into heaven, and there is to abide till the end of the world, it becometh not any of the faithful to believe or profess, that there is a real or corporeal presence (as they phrase it) of the body and blood of Christ in the holy eucharist. The sacrament of the Lord's supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped.

XXX. Of the One oblation of Christ finished upon the Cross.—The offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin but that alone; wherefore the sacrifices of masses, in which it was commonly said, that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were fables and dangerous deceits.

XXXI. A single life is imposed on none by the word of God.—Bishops, priests, and deacons are not

commanded by God's law, either to avow the estate of single life, or to abstain from marriage.

XXXII. Excommunicated Persons are to be avoided.—That person which, by open denunciation of the church, is rightly cut off from the unity of the church, and excommunicate, ought to be taken of the whole multitude of the faithful as a heathen and a publican, until he be openly reconciled by penance, and received into the church by a judge that hath authority thereunto.

XXXIII. Of the traditions of the Church.—It is not necessary, that traditions and ceremonies be in all places one and utterly alike, for at all times they have been divers, and may be changed according to the diversity of countries, times, and men's manners, so that nothing be ordained against God's word. Whosoever, through his private judgment, willingly and purposely doth openly break the traditions and ceremonies of the church, which be not repugnant to the word of God, and be ordained and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked openly (that others may fear to do the like), as one that offendeth against the common order of the church, and hurteth the authority of the magistrate, and woundeth the consciences of weak brethren.

XXXIV. Of the Homilies.—The homilies lately delivered and commended to the church of England by the king's injunction, do contain a godly and wholesome doctrine, and fit to be embraced by all men; and for that cause they are diligently, *plainly*, and distinctly to be read to the people.

XXXV. Of the Book of Common Prayer, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of England.—The book lately delivered to the church of

England by the king and parliament, containing the manner and form of public prayer, and the ministration of the sacraments in the said church of England, as also the book published by the same authority for ordering ministers in the church, are both of them very pious, as to the truth of doctrine: in nothing contrary, but agreeable to the wholesome doctrine of the gospel, which they do very much promote and illustrate. And for that cause they are, by all faithful members of the church of England, but chiefly of the ministers of the word, with all thankfulness and readiness of mind, to be received, approved, and commended to the people of God.

XXXVI. Of the Civil Magistrates.—The king of England is, *after Christ*, the supreme *head* on earth of the church of England and Ireland. The bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England. The civil magistrate is ordained and approved by God, and therefore is to be obeyed, not only for fear of wrath, but for conscience sake. Civil or temporal laws may punish Christian men with death for heinous and grievous offences. It is lawful for Christian men, at the commandment of the magistrate, to wear weapons, and to serve in the wars.

XXXVII. The Goods of Christians are not common.—The riches and goods of Christians are not common as touching the right, title, and possession of the same, as certain Anabaptists do falsely boast. Notwithstanding, every man ought, of such things as he possesseth, liberally to give alms to the poor, according to his ability.

XXXVIII. It is lawful for a Christian to take an Oath.—As we confess that vain and rash swearing is

forbidden Christian men by our Lord Jesus Christ, and James his Apostle; so we judge that Christian religion doth not prohibit, but that a man may swear when the magistrate requireth, according to the Prophet's teaching, in justice, judgment, and truth.

XXXIX. The Resurrection of the Dead is not past already.—The resurrection of the dead is not past already, as if it belonged only to the soul, which by the grace of Christ is raised from the death of sin, but it is to be expected by all men in the last day: for at that time (as the Scripture doth most apparently testify) the dead shall be restored to their own bodies, flesh, and bones: to the end that man, according as either righteously or wickedly he hath passed this life, may according to his works receive rewards or punishments.

XL. The Souls of Men deceased do not perish with their Bodies.—They who maintain that the souls of men deceased do either sleep, without all manner of sense, to the day of judgment, or affirm that they die together with the body, and shall be raised therewith at the last day, do wholly differ from the right faith and orthodox belief, which is delivered to us in the Holy Scripture.

XLI. Of the Millenarians.—They who endeavour to revive the fable of the Millenarians are therein contrary to the Holy Scriptures, and cast themselves down headlong into Jewish dotages.

XLII. All Men not to be saved at last.—They also deserve to be condemned who endeavour to restore that pernicious opinion, that all men, though never so ungodly, shall at last be saved: when for a certain time, appointed

by the divine justice, they have endured punishment for their sins committed.

THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES OF ELIZABETH.

I. Of Faith in the Holy Trinity.—There is but one living and true God, everlasting, without body, parts, or passions; of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness; the Maker, and Preserver of all things both visible and invisible. And in unity of this Godhead there be three Persons, of one substance, power, and eternity; the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

II. Of the Word or Son of God, which was made very Man.—The Son, which is the Word of the Father, begotten from everlasting of the Father, the very and eternal God, and of one substance with the Father, took Man's nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin, of her substance: so that two whole and perfect Natures, that is to say, the Godhead and Manhood, were joined together in one Person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God, and very Man; who truly suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried, to reconcile his Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for actual sins of men.

III. Of the going down of Christ into Hell.—As Christ died for us, and was buried, so also is it to be believed, that he went down into Hell.

IV. Of the Resurrection of Christ.—Christ did truly rise again from death, and took again his body, with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection

of Man's nature; wherewith he ascended into Heaven, and there sitteth, until he return to judge all Men at the last day.

V. Of the Holy Ghost.—The Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son, is of one substance, majesty, and glory, with the Father and the Son, very and eternal God.

VI. Of the Sufficiency of the holy Scriptures for Salvation.—Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation. In the name of the holy Scripture we do understand those Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church.

Of the Names and Number of the Canonical Books.

Genesis,
Exodus,
Leviticus,
Numbers,
Deuteronomy,
Joshua,
Judges,
Ruth,
The First Book of Samuel,
The Second Book of Samuel,
The First Book of Kings,
The Second Book of Kings,
The First Book of Chronicles,
The Second Book of Chronicles,
The First Book of Esdras,
The Second Book of Esdras,
The Book of Esther,
The Book of Job,
The Psalms,
The Proverbs,
Ecclesiastes or Preacher,
Cantica, or Songs of Solomon,
Four Prophets the greater,
Twelve Prophets the less.

And the other Books (as *Hierome* saith) the Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners; but yet doth it not apply them to establish any doctrine; such are these following:

The Third Book of Esdras,
The Fourth Book of Esdras,
The Book of Tobias,
The Book of Judith,
The rest of the Book of Esther,
The Book of Wisdom,
Jesus the Son of Sirach,
Baruch the Prophet,
The Song of the Three Children,
The Story of Susanna,
Of Bel and the Dragon,
The Prayer of Manasses,
The First Book of Maccabees,
The Second Book of Maccabees,

All the Books of the New Testament, as they are commonly received, we do receive, and account them Canonical.

VII. Of the Old Testament.—The Old Testament is not contrary to the New: for both in the Old and New Testament everlasting life is offered to Mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and Man, being both God and Man. Wherefore they are not to be heard, which feign that the old Fathers did look only for transitory promises. Although the Law given from God by Moses, as touching Ceremonies and Rites, do not bind Christian men, nor the Civil precepts thereof ought of necessity to be received in any commonwealth; yet notwithstanding, no Christian man whatsoever is free from the obedience of the Commandments which are called Moral.

VIII. Of the Three Creeds.—The Three Creeds, *Nicene* Creed, *Athanasius's* Creed, and that which is commonly called the *Apostles'* Creed, ought thoroughly to be

received and believed: for they may be proved by most certain warrants of holy Scripture.

IX. Of Original or Birth-sin.—Original Sin standeth not in the following of *Adam*, (as the *Pelagians* do vainly talk;) but it is the fault and corruption of the Nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of *Adam;* whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined to evil, so that the flesh lusteth always contrary to the spirit; and therefore in every person born into this world, it deserveth God's wrath and damnation. And this infection of nature doth remain, yea in them that are regenerated; whereby the lust of the flesh, called in the Greek, *phronema sarkos*, which some do expound the wisdom, some sensuality, some the affection, some the desire, of the flesh, is not subject to the Law of God. And although there is no condemnation for them that believe and are baptized, yet the Apostle doth confess, that concupiscence and lust hath of itself the nature of sin.

X. Of Free-Will.—The condition of Man after the fall of *Adam* is such, that he cannot turn and prepare himself, by his own natural strength and good works, to faith, and calling upon God: Wherefore we have no power to do good works pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of God by Christ preventing us, that we may have a good will, and working with us, when we have that good will.

XI. Of the Justification of Man.—We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by Faith, and not for our own works or deservings: Wherefore, that we are justified by Faith only is a most wholesome Doctrine, and very full

of comfort, as more largely is expressed in the Homily of Justification.

XII. Of Good Works.—Albeit that Good Works, which are the Fruits of Faith, and follow after Justification, cannot put away our sins, and endure the severity of God's Judgment; yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and do spring out necessarily of a true and lively Faith; insomuch that by them a lively Faith may be as evidently known as a tree discerned by the fruit.

XIII. Of Works before Justification.—Works done before the grace of Christ, and the Inspiration of his Spirit, are not pleasant to God, forasmuch as they spring not of faith in Jesus Christ, neither do they make men meet to receive grace, or (as the School-authors say) deserve grace of congruity; yea rather, for that they are not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done, we doubt not but they have the nature of sin.

XIV. Of Works of Supererogation.—Voluntary Works, besides over and above God's Commandments, which they call Works of Supererogation, cannot be taught without arrogancy and impiety: for by them men do declare, that they do not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that they do more for his sake, than of bounden duty is required: whereas Christ saith plainly, When ye have done all that are commanded to you, say, We are unprofitable servants.

XV. Of Christ alone without Sin.—Christ in the truth of our nature was made like unto us in all things, sin only except, from which he was clearly void, both in his flesh, and in his spirit. He came to be the Lamb without spot, who, by sacrifice of himself once made, should take away the sins of the world, and sin, as Saint *John* saith, was

not in him. But all we the rest, although baptized, and born again in Christ, yet offend in many things; and if we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.

XVI. Of Sin after Baptism.—Not every deadly sin willingly committed after Baptism is sin against the Holy Ghost, and unpardonable. Wherefore the grant of repentance is not to be denied to such as fall into sin after Baptism. After we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace given, and fall into sin, and by the grace of God we may arise again, and amend our lives. And therefore they are to be condemned, which say, they can no more sin as long as they live here, or deny the place of forgiveness to such as truly repent.

XVII. Of Predestination and Election.—Predestination to Life is the everlasting purpose of God, whereby (before the foundations of the world were laid) he hath constantly decreed by his counsel secret to us, to deliver from curse and damnation those whom he hath chosen in Christ out of mankind, and to bring them by Christ to everlasting salvation, as vessels made to honour. Wherefore, they which be endued with so excellent a benefit of God be called according to God's purpose by his Spirit working in due season: they through Grace obey the calling: they be justified freely: they be made sons of God by adoption: they be made like the image of his only-begotten Son Jesus Christ: they walk religiously in good works, and at length, by God's mercy, they attain to everlasting felicity.

As the godly consideration of Predestination, and our Election in Christ, is full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort to godly persons, and such as feel in them-

selves the working of the Spirit of Christ, mortifying the works of the flesh, and their earthly members, and drawing up their mind to high and heavenly things, as well because it doth greatly establish and confirm their faith of eternal Salvation to be enjoyed through Christ, as because it doth fervently kindle their love towards God: So, for curious and carnal persons, lacking the Spirit of Christ, to have continually before their eyes the sentence of God's Predestination, is a most dangerous downfall, whereby the Devil doth thrust them either into desperation, or into wretchlessness of most unclean living, no less perilous than desperation.

Furthermore, we must receive God's promises in such wise, as they be generally set forth to us in holy Scripture: and, in our doings, that Will of God is to be followed, which we have expressly declared unto us in the Word of God.

XVIII. Of obtaining eternal Salvation only by the Name of Christ.—They also are to be had accursed that presume to say, That every man shall be saved by the Law or Sect which he professeth, so that he be diligent to frame his life according to that Law, and the light of Nature. For holy Scripture doth set out unto us only the Name of Jesus Christ, whereby men must be saved.

XIX. Of the Church.—The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.

As the Church of *Jerusalem*, *Alexandria*, and *Antioch*, have erred; so also the Church of *Rome* hath erred; not only in their living and manner of Ceremonies, but also in matters of Faith.

XX. Of the Authority of the Church.—The Church hath power to decree Rites or Ceremonies, and authority in Controversies of Faith: And yet it is not lawful for the Church to ordain any thing that is contrary to God's Word written, neither may it so expound one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another. Wherefore, although the Church be a witness and a keeper of holy Writ, yet, as it ought not to decree any thing against the same, so besides the same ought it not to enforce any thing to be believed for necessity of Salvation.

XXI. Of the Authority of General Councils.—General Councils may not be gathered together without the commandment and will of Princes. And when they be gathered together, (forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the Spirit and Word of God,) they may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining unto God. Wherefore things ordained by them as necessary to salvation have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of holy Scripture.

XXII. Of Purgatory.—The Romish Doctrine concerning Purgatory, Pardons, Worshipping and Adoration, as well of Images as of Reliques, and also invocation of Saints, is a fond thing vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God.

XXIII. Of Ministering in the Congregation.—It is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of publick preaching, or ministering the Sacraments in the Congregation, before he be lawfully called, and sent to execute the same. And those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work

by men who have publick authority given unto them in the Congregation, to call and send Ministers into the Lord's vineyard.

XXIV. Of speaking in the Congregation in such a tongue as the people understandeth.—It is a thing plainly repugnant to the Word of God, and the custom of the Primitive Church, to have publick Prayer in the Church, or to minister the Sacraments in a tongue not understanded of the people.

XXV. Of the Sacraments.—Sacraments ordained of Christ be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather they be certain sure witnesses, and effectual signs of grace, and God's good will towards us, by the which he doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our Faith in him.

There are two Sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel, that is to say, Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord.

Those five commonly called Sacraments, that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and extreme Unction, are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel, being such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the Apostles, partly are states of life allowed in the Scriptures; but yet have not like nature of Sacraments with Baptism, and the Lord's Supper, for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God.

The Sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about, but that we should duly use them. And in such only as worthily receive the same they have a wholesome effect or operation: but they that receive them unworthily purchase to themselves damnation, as Saint *Paul* saith.

XXVI. Of the Unworthiness of the Ministers which hinders not the effect of the Sacrament.—Although in the visible Church the evil be ever mingled with the good, and sometimes the evil have chief authority in the Ministration of the Word and Sacraments, yet forasmuch as they do not the same in their own name, but in Christ's, and do minister by his commission and authority, we may use their Ministry, both in hearing the Word of God, and in receiving of the Sacraments. Neither is the effect of Christ's ordinance taken away by their wickedness, nor the grace of God's gifts diminished from such as by faith and rightly do receive the Sacraments ministered unto them; which be effectual, because of Christ's institution and promise, although they be ministered by evil men.

Nevertheless, it appertaineth to the discipline of the Church, that enquiry be made of evil Ministers, and that they be accused by those that have knowledge of their offences; and finally being found guilty, by just judgment be deposed.

XXVII. Of Baptism.—Baptism is not only a sign of profession, and mark of difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from others that be not christened, but it is also a sign of Regeneration or new Birth, whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive Baptism rightly are grafted into the Church; the promises of forgiveness of sin, and of our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed; Faith is confirmed, and Grace increased by virtue of prayer unto God. The Baptism of young Children is in any wise to be retained in the Church, as most agreeable with the institution of Christ.

XXVIII. Of the Lord's Supper.—The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another; but rather is a Sacrament of our Redemption by Christ's death: insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith, receive the same, the Bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ; and likewise the Cup of Blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ.

Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of Bread and Wine) in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by holy Writ; but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions.

The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper, is Faith.

The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped.

XXIX. Of the Wicked which eat not the Body of Christ in the use of the Lord's Supper.—The Wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth (as Saint *Augustine* saith) the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, yet in no wise are they partakers of Christ: but rather, to their condemnation, do eat and drink the sign or Sacrament of so great a thing.

XXX. Of both kinds.—The Cup of the Lord is not to be denied to the Lay-people: for both the parts of the Lord's Sacrament, by Christ's ordinance and commandment, ought to be ministered to all Christian men alike.

XXXI. Of the one Oblation of Christ finished

UPON THE CROSS.—The Offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction, for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said, that the Priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits.

XXXII. OF THE MARRIAGE OF PRIESTS.—Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, are not commanded by God's Law, either to vow the estate of single life, or to abstain from marriage: therefore it is lawful for them, as for all other Christian men, to marry at their own discretion, as they shall judge the same to serve better to godliness.

XXXIII. OF EXCOMMUNICATE PERSONS, HOW THEY ARE TO BE AVOIDED.—That person which by open denunciation of the Church is rightly cut off from the unity of the Church, and excommunicated, ought to be taken of the whole multitude of the faithful, as an Heathen and Publican, until he be openly reconciled by penance, and received into the Church by a Judge that hath authority thereunto.

XXXIV. OF THE TRADITIONS OF THE CHURCH.—It is not necessary that Traditions and Ceremonies be in all places one, and utterly like; for at all times they have been divers, and may be changed according to the diversities of countries, times, and men's manners, so that nothing be ordained against God's Word. Whosoever through his private judgment, willingly and purposely, doth openly break the traditions and ceremonies of the Church, which be not repugnant to the Word of God, and be ordained and approved by common authority, ought to

be rebuked openly, (that others may fear to do the like,) as he that offendeth against the common order of the Church, and hurteth the authority of the Magistrate, and woundeth the consciences of the weak brethren.

Every particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish, ceremonies or rites of the Church ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying.

XXXV. Of the Homilies.—The second Book of Homilies, the several titles whereof we have joined under this Article, doth contain a godly and wholesome Doctrine, and necessary for these times, as doth the former Book of Homilies, which were set forth in the time of *Edward* the Sixth; and therefore we judge them to be read in Churches by the Ministers, diligently and distinctly, that they may be understanded of the people.

Of the Names of the Homilies.

1 Of the right Use of the Church.
2 Against peril of Idolatry.
3 Of repairing and keeping clean of Churches.
4 Of good works: first of Fasting.
5 Against Gluttony and Drunkenness.
6 Against Excess of Apparel.
7 Of Prayer.
8 Of the Place and Time of Prayer.
9 That Common Prayers and Sacraments ought to be ministered in a known tongue.
10 Of the reverend estimation of God's Word.
11 Of Alms-doing.
12 Of the Nativity of Christ.
13 Of the Passion of Christ.
14 Of the Resurrection of Christ.
15 Of the worthy receiving of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ.

16 Of the Gifts of the Holy Ghost.
17 For the Rogation-days.
18 Of the state of Matrimony.
19 Of Repentance.
20 Against Idleness.
21 Against Rebellion.

XXXVI. Of Consecration of Bishops and Ministers.—The Book of Consecration of Archbishops and Bishops, and Ordering of Priests and Deacons, lately set forth in the time of *Edward* the Sixth, and confirmed at the same time by authority of Parliament, doth contain all things necessary to such Consecration and Ordering: neither hath it any thing, that of itself is superstitious and ungodly. And therefore whosoever are consecrated or ordered according to the Rites of that Book, since the second year of the forenamed King *Edward* unto this time, or hereafter shall be consecrated or ordered according to the same Rites; we decree all such to be rightly, orderly, and lawfully consecrated and ordered.

XXXVII. Of the Civil Magistrates.—The Queen's Majesty hath the chief power in this Realm of *England*, and other her Dominions, unto whom the chief Government of all Estates of this Realm, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Civil, in all causes doth appertain, and is not, nor ought to be, subject to any foreign Jurisdiction.

Whereas we attribute to the Queen's Majesty the chief government, by which Title we understand the minds of some slanderous folks to be offended; we give not to our Princes the ministering either of God's Word, or of the Sacraments, the which thing the Injunctions also lately set forth by *Elizabeth* our Queen do most plainly testify; but that only prerogative, which we see to have been given always to all godly Princes in holy Scriptures by God himself; that is, that they should rule all states and degrees

committed to their charge by God, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Temporal, and restrain with the civil sword the stubborn and evil-doers.

The Bishop of *Rome* hath no jurisdiction in this Realm of *England*.

The Laws of the Realm may punish Christian men with death for heinous and grievous offences.

It is lawful for Christian men, at the commandment of the Magistrate, to wear weapons, and serve in the wars.

XXXVIII. Of Christian men's Goods, which are not common.—The Riches and Goods of Christians are not common, as touching the right, title, and possession of the same, as certain Anabaptists do falsely boast. Notwithstanding, every man ought, of such things as he possesseth, liberally to give alms to the poor, according to his ability.

XXXIX. Of a Christian man's Oath.—As we confess that vain and rash Swearing is forbidden Christian men by our Lord Jesus Christ, and *James* his Apostle, so we judge, that Christian Religion doth not prohibit, but that a man may swear when the Magistrate requireth, in a cause of faith and charity, so it be done according to the Prophet's teaching, in justice, judgment, and truth.

FINIS.

283
Waterworth, W. W17
AUTHOR
Origin and Developments of
TITLE